

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

OCTOBER, 1901.

ARTICLE I.

THE CALL TO THE MINISTRY.*

AUGSBURG CONFESSION, ARTICLE XIV.

BY PRESIDENT JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

The Fourteenth Article of the Augsburg Confession, which is the one assigned for discussion in this lecture, treats, according to its title, of *Ecclesiastical Orders*. More specifically its subject is *The Call to the Ministry*.

The general subject of *The Ministry of the Church* is presented in the Fifth Article, and any discussion of the origin, nature and functions of the ministry belongs more properly under that article. And yet the two articles are so closely connected, and the view taken of the call to the ministerial office depends so largely, at least in some of its phases, on the views held concerning the nature and institution of the office, and its relation to the Church, that it is almost impossible to discuss the former without making some reference also to the latter. Hence it will be well to have the language of both articles clearly before us.

The Fourth Article treats of *Justification*, and emphasizes the fact that men "are justified freely for Christ's sake through faith," and that "this faith God doth impute for righteousness before him." Then follows the Fifth Article: "For the obtaining of this faith, the ministry of teaching the gospel and administering the sacraments was instituted. For by the word

*Holman Lecture on the Augsburg Confession for 1901, delivered in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., May 17th, 1901.

and sacraments, as by instruments, the Holy Spirit is given; who worketh faith, where and when it pleaseth God, in those that hear the gospel, to wit, that God, not for our merit's sake, but for Christ's sake, doth justify those who believe that they for Christ's sake are received into favor.

"They condemn the Anabaptists and others, who imagine that the Holy Spirit is given to men without the outward word, through their own preparations and works."*

The Fourteenth Article reads as follows: "Concerning ecclesiastical orders [Church Government], they teach, that no man should publicly in the Church teach, or administer the sacraments, except he be rightly called [without a regular call]."

This article has at least the merit of brevity. In the Latin it consists of only seventeen words, making it by considerable the shortest of all the articles. It might be supposed that it would be correspondingly clear and easy to be understood. But brevity does not always conduce to clearness, especially in theology. Probably most cursory readers would pronounce the Apostles' Creed a model of clearness, as well as of conciseness, in comparison with either the Nicene Creed or the Athanasian Creed. But every student of theology knows that either one of the longer creeds settles definitely and positively a score or more of questions which the shorter and apparently simpler Apostles' Creed leaves open to controversy.

Certainly the brevity of the Fourteenth Article of our noble *Augustana* has not saved the Church from controversy over the meaning of the *rite vocatus* or *ordentliche Beruf* as it is in the German. Carpzov, in his *Isagogics*, published in 1665, enumerates under this article twenty four distinct points of controversy which even then already had been raised and discussed, either among the Lutherans themselves, or between them and their opponents, the Catholics and Anabaptists. It is true that some of these questions seem to deal more properly with the general subject of the ministerial office, as presented in the Fifth

*This translation is from the edition of the Book of Concord, published by Dr. H. E. Jacobs in 1882, and the translations of this edition will be used throughout this lecture without further reference or explanation.

Article, but at least fifteen of the twenty-four relate directly to the *rite vocatus*, or *ordentliche Beruf*, if we include in this, as all our theologians do, the examination and ordination of candidates for the sacred office and work of the ministry. And if anyone desires evidence that these controversies were not all settled by the theological giants of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, he only needs to recall the bitter disputes between the "Old Lutherans" in Germany during the middle and latter part of the last century, or the no less bitter controversy between the Missourians and the Buffalo and Iowa synods in this country, or the protracted and sometimes acrimonious discussions in our own General Synod over the question of the ministerium. The fact is that a true Lutheran doctrine of the ministry seems never to have been very fully or definitely stated or settled, either by the confessional writings of the Church or by our leading dogmaticians. Hence we find the confessional statements interpreted in different ways, and the same dogmaticians quoted as authorities to prove quite different, and sometimes directly opposite, views. And this will likely continue to be the case until, in some general council, or diet, representing the whole Lutheran Church throughout the world, a full and authoritative statement of the doctrine is agreed upon. Indeed, it is a question whether even that would stop the controversy, and secure unity of doctrine, since according to our Lutheran Church polity, no such deliverance could be made to have more than advisory authority.

The primary purpose of the Reformers in framing this Fourteenth Article was, without doubt, to guard against, or to correct, two perversions of, or false inferences from, the doctrine of the universal priesthood of all believers, which Luther had announced publicly first in his sermon on the mass in 1520,* and on which he laid great, and perhaps in the early part of his ministry, excessive emphasis, as over against the Romish doctrine of a special priesthood in the Christian Church similar to the Aaronic priesthood of the Jewish Church. For example, in his *Address to the Christian Nobility*, written in the same year,

*See Hay's *Köstlin's Theology of Luther*, vol. 1, page 361.

1520, he expresses himself very fully and strongly on this subject, declaring that "their [the Romanists'] idea of the spiritual order, as they call the pope, bishops, priests and monks, has no foundation; for all Christians belong to the spiritual order by virtue of one baptism, according to 1 Peter 2 : 9 and Romans 5 : 10. There is here no difference of order, but only a difference of office." It is true that he immediately guards against the possible abuse of this doctrine by adding that "to exercise this office does not befit every one; for, just because all as priests have equal authority, dare no single one, without our, that is, the Christian community's or congregation's consent and choice, presume to exercise the office for which all have authority."*

But, notwithstanding this *caveat* the Romanists seized on Luther's doctrine of the universal priesthood as the basis for a charge that he and his followers had done away with a regular ministry, and had introduced chaos and anarchy into the Church by granting to each and every member the right to perform all the functions of the minister, or priest.

On the other hand, the Anabaptists, in their fanatical zeal, made the same doctrine of the universal priesthood the excuse and ground for all manner of disorder and excess. They claimed to be under the special direction of the Holy Spirit, and by virtue of the revelation thus given to have the right to declare what was revealed, without authority or permission from any other person, or power, either civil or ecclesiastical, inasmuch as all Christians were equally kings and priests unto God.

Now, it was to correct both these errors, the false charges of the Romanists, on the one hand, and the false teaching and practice of the fanatics, on the other hand, that the Reformers declared in this Fourteenth Article of their Confession that "no man should publicly in the Church teach, or administer the sacraments, except he be rightly called," (*nisi rite vocatus*), or (*ohne ordentlichen Beruf*).

So Gerhard says:† "These words of the Confession are op-

*Hay's *Köstlin's Theology of Luther*, Vol. I., p. 371.

†*Loc. Theol. De Min. Eccl.* Cap. III., Sec. 1., Quoted by Dr. H. E. Jacobs in *Lutheran Quarterly*, vol. IV., p. 567.

posed; 1. To the calumnies of the Papists who made the charge that in our churches all things were done in confusion and without order, and that the power to teach was granted by us to everyone in the Church. 2. To the confusion of the Anabaptists, who without a call take upon themselves the parts of the ministry of the Church, and allow all promiscuously the office of teaching, introducing in this way barbarous disorder in the Church."

The Catholics were satisfied with this Fourteenth Article, and it was approved in the Confutation prepared by their theologians, but with a fuller explanation of the *rite vocatus*, making it to include canonical ordination by the Catholic bishops. This called forth from Melancthon a mild protest in *The Apology*, as follows:

"The Fourteenth Article, in which we say that the administration of the sacraments and word, in the Church, ought to be allowed to no one *unless he be rightly called*, they receive in such a way as though we nevertheless employ canonical ordination. Concerning this subject, we have frequently testified in this assembly that it is our greatest wish to maintain Church polity and the grades in the Church, even though they have been made by human authority (provided the bishops allow our doctrine and receive our priests). For we know that Church discipline was instituted by the Fathers, in the manner laid down in the ancient canons, with a good and useful intention. But the bishops either compel our priests to reject and condemn the kinds of doctrine which we have confessed, or, by a new and unheard of cruelty, they put to death the poor innocent men. These causes hinder our priests from acknowledging such bishops. Thus the cruelty of the bishops is the reason why that canonical government, which we greatly desired to maintain, is in some places dissolved. Let them see to it how they will give account to God for dispersing the Church. In this matter, our consciences are not in danger, because since we know that our confession is true, godly and Catholic, we ought not to approve the cruelty of those who persecute this doctrine. And we know that the Church is with those who teach the

Word of God aright, and not with those who not only by their edicts endeavor to efface God's Word, but also put to death those who teach what is right and true; towards whom, even though they do something contrary to the canons, yet the very canons are milder. Furthermore, we wish here again to testify that we will gladly maintain ecclesiastical and canonical order, provided the bishops only cease to rage against our Churches. This our desire will clear us both before God and among all nations to all posterity from the imputation against us, that the authority of the bishops is being undermined, when men read and hear that, although protesting against the unrighteous cruelty of the bishops, we could not obtain justice."

The threat is here clearly implied, though somewhat veiled under the courteous phraseology of the gentle and irenic Melancthon, that if the Lutherans could not secure justice and fair treatment from the regularly constituted bishops of the Catholic Church, they would ignore them and would assert their right to call and ordain their own priests and ministers, without the consent or aid of the bishops. But this right is much more clearly asserted and strongly maintained, in the Schmalcald Articles, written in the closing days of 1536 by the vigorous hand of Luther himself, by direction of the Elector of Saxony, and presented to that Prince, January 3rd 1537:* "If the bishops were true bishops, and would devote themselves to the Church and the gospel, they might be allowed, for the sake of love and unity, and not from necessity, to ordain and confirm us and our preachers; nevertheless, under the condition that all masks and phantoms [deceptions, absurdities and appearances] of unchristian nature and display be laid aside. Yet because they neither are, nor wish to be true bishops, but worldly lords and princes, who will neither preach, nor teach, nor baptize, nor administer the Lord's Supper, nor perform any work or office of the Church, but persecute and condemn those who being called discharge this duty; for their sake the Church ought not to remain without ministers.

"Therefore as the ancient examples of the Church and the

*See Part III., Article X., *Of Ordination and the Call.*

Fathers teach us, we ourselves will and ought to ordain suitable persons to this office; and (even according to their own laws) they have not the right to forbid or prevent us. For their laws say that those ordained even by heretics should be regarded and remain as ordained, as St. Jerome writes to the Church at Alexandria, that at first it was governed by bishops through the priests and preachers."

But more vigorous and emphatic still is the language used in the *Appendix* to the Schmalcald Articles, written by the theologians who were present at the Convention at Schmalcald in 1537, but prepared more especially by Melancthon, Luther being sick at the time.* This section is too extended to be quoted in full. Only those parts are given, therefore, which refer more particularly to the Church's right to elect and ordain its own ministers independently of the bishops. After quoting Jerome to prove that the distinction in grades between bishops and other ministers was entirely a matter of human authority, and not of divine right, they continue: "But since by divine authority the grades of bishops and pastors are not diverse, it is manifest that ordination by a pastor in his own church has been appointed by divine law [if a pastor in his own church ordain certain suitable persons to the ministry, such ordination is, according to divine law, undoubtedly effective and right].

"Therefore when the regular bishops become enemies of the Church, or are unwilling to administer ordination, the Churches retain their own right. [Because the regular bishops persecute the gospel and refuse to ordain suitable persons, every church has in this case full authority to ordain its own ministers].

"For wherever the church is, there is the authority [command] to administer the gospel. Wherefore it is necessary for the church to retain the authority to call, elect and ordain ministers. And this authority is a gift exclusively given to the church, which no human power can wrest from the church, as Paul also testifies to the Ephesians (4 : 8) when he says, he ascended, he gave gifts to men. And he enumerates among the gifts especially belonging to the Church 'pastors and teachers,' and

*See part II. of the *Power and Jurisdiction of Bishops*.

adds that such are given 'for the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.' Where there is, therefore, a true church, the right to elect and ordain ministers necessarily exists, just as in a case of necessity even a layman absolves, and becomes the minister and pastor of another; as Augustine narrates the story of two Christians in a ship, one of whom baptized the catechumen, who after baptism then absolved the baptizer.

"Here belong the words of Christ which testify that the keys have been given to the church, and not merely to certain persons, (Matt. 18 : 20). 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, etc.'

"Lastly the declaration of Peter also confirms this (I Peter 2 : 9). 'Ye are a royal priesthood.' These words pertain to the true Church, which, since it alone has the priesthood, certainly has the right to elect and ordain ministers.

"And this also a most common custom of the Church testifies. For formerly the people elected pastors and bishops. Then a bishop was added, either of that church or a neighboring one, who confirmed the one elected by the laying on of hands; neither was ordination anything else than such a ratification. * * * From all these things it is clear that the Church retains the right to elect and ordain ministers."

We now have before us the entire testimony of our Lutheran Symbols on the subject of the *rite vocatus*. There are, indeed, various other brief, or incidental references to the subject, scattered here and there, but nothing that throws any additional light upon it, or that would in any way modify the sense, or implication, of the parts already quoted.

We stop here, therefore, to inquire what points are made clear by these authoritative deliverances. Not very many, you may think, and if you so think, you will be correct. And yet we have here absolutely everything concerning the call to the ministry that is of confessional authority in our Church, even if all were to accept all the Symbolical Books, as some claim to do "in their own true, native, original and only sense." The ground may be covered and the facts stated in three or four brief and simple propositions, such as :

1. That no one can lawfully preach the gospel or administer the sacraments publicly in the Church without a regular call.

2. That the essential thing in a regular call is the election by the Church, and that ordination has simply the force of a public and formal ratification of such election, and is therefore not absolutely necessary to make the call regular and valid.

3. That the right to elect, call and ordain its own pastors, is inherent in the Church, having been bestowed upon it by Christ himself as a divine gift, growing out of or associated with the possession of the keys, and the universal priesthood of all believers.

4. That the necessity for a call is not absolute, but relative, and that, therefore, in cases of extreme necessity, even a layman, without ordination, or election by the Church, may preach the Word, absolve, and even administer the sacraments.

Much more may be drawn from the writings of Luther, and of the other great theologians of the Church, such as Chemnitz, (1522-1586), Hutter, (1563-1616), Baier, (1647-1695), Hollaz, (1648-1713), and many others. But all this is of the nature of comment, explanation, interpretation and development, and has only such authority as belongs to that which commends itself to our judgment, or as attaches to the name and standing of the individual writer. The writings of no one of these men, great and learned as they were, not even those of Luther the greatest of them all, have ever been accepted or recognized by the Church as a whole, nor by any branch of it, as having any confessional authority whatever.

Moreover these theologians are by no means always consistent with each other, or even with themselves. One writer may emphasize one phase of the subject, while another one may lay his chief emphasis on another phase of it, and thus they may seem to differ very greatly, or even to flatly contradict each other, especially when quoted out of connection, and in isolated passages, by partisan debaters. Or, the same writer may, in one part of his discussion, or at one stage of his development, press a point, or carry an argument, farther than at another

time, or in a different connection, and hence be at least apparently inconsistent with himself. Indeed, this is very likely to be the case with every real student who is growing in knowledge, and especially in clearness of insight and breadth of view, as every true student should and will be. Woe to the man who has become so vain of his present attainments, or is so set in his opinions, that he thinks there is nothing more for him to learn, or that it would be a discredit for him to revise, or correct, or even totally disown anything that he has previously believed or taught.

Every one who has read extensively in the writings of Luther knows well how little he cared for that precise and careful consistency which is characteristic of small men, and especially of narrow-minded men; that there is hardly an important doctrine which he teaches in reference to which he has not been quoted again and again in support of very different and even quite opposite views. The great Reformer was too busy fighting the pope and the errors of Romanism, and the fanatics and other enemies of the truth, and too eager to deal them the hardest blows possible, to think much about consistency, or to stop long to inquire whether everything spoken and written at one time was in perfect harmony with all that he had previously spoken or written. When a man is in the thick of the fight, and hard pressed by the foe, as Luther was almost daily, he does not greatly care whether every blow is delivered according to the manual of arms or not. What he is most concerned about is how to protect his own head, and how to defeat the enemy at every point. And this was Luther's great concern, to expose error, and to vindicate and establish the truth. And if, in order to do this, it should be necessary to change his position, he never hesitated to do so, because he might thereby expose himself to the charge of inconsistency, provided always, of course, that the truth was not sacrificed. It is unfortunate that not all who call themselves Lutherans have always remembered this when appealing to his name and writings in support of their own peculiar views. If they had done so, there would have been less quarreling among them, and, the Lutheran

Church might not to-day be split up into so many divisions, which too often spend their time and strength in warring against each other instead of against the common foes which Luther himself fought so valiantly.

Certain it is that in reference to this doctrine of the ministry, and the *rite vocatus*, Luther shifted his ground, or at least the emphasis of his teaching, very considerably between his earlier and his later years. This is brought out very clearly by Köstlin in his *Theology of Luther*. In his earlier teaching Luther, in opposition to the Romish doctrine of a special priesthood, or order of ministers, in the Church, so emphasized the universal priesthood of all believers, that he seems to make the ministry to be nothing more than the universal priesthood in function, a simple transfer to one member of the congregation of the rights and privileges which belong inherently to every member, in order to avoid the confusion and disorder which would result if all were to attempt to exercise their right to preach and administer the sacraments at the same time. Thus, in his *Address to the Christian Nobility*, published in 1520, he declares that "all Christians belong to the spiritual order by virtue of one baptism, one gospel, one faith. We all become priests by baptism, according to 1 Peter, 2 : 9, and Rev. 5 : 10. There is here no difference of order, but only a difference of office. To exercise this office does not, however, besit everyone ; for, just because we all as priests have equal authority, dare no single one, without our, that is, the Christian community's or congregation's consent and choice, presume to exercise the office for which all have authority."*

It is in this same connection that there occurs the well-known illustration of the "ten brothers" so often quoted by those who are disposed to take this low democratic, or extreme congregational view of the office, of the ministry and of the call. It is, says Luther, "just as though ten brothers, or princes, or heirs of equal rank, should select one of their number to manage the inheritance for them all. To make the principle still more plain, the case is supposed of a little band of Christians, without any

*Köstlin, Vol. I., p. 372.

ordained priest or bishop in their company captured by an enemy and placed by themselves in a wilderness. Should these now elect one of their number, and confer upon him the office of baptizing, holding mass, absolving and preaching, such an one would be as truly a priest as though all the bishops in the world, and the pope, had ordained him."* In his *Babylonian Captivity*, published in the same year, 1520, he presents substantially the same views and supports them by much the same line of arguments.

In 1523 he wrote his *Address to the Council and People of Prague*, and also a pamphlet entitled, *That a Christian Assembly, or Congregation has the Right and Authority to Judge all Doctrines, to Call Teachers, etc.* Referring to these documents Köstlin says:† "The fundamental idea here is again that contained in the thesis. A priest is not the same as a presbyter or minister, (*Sacerdotum non esse quod presbyterum vel ministrum*), the former is born, the latter made. He then proceeds to present, in some respects, more fully than in any of his earlier writings, the functions of the born priesthood, embracing them under seven heads, as follows: 1. The proclamation of the Word. 2. Baptism, which even women are allowed to administer in cases of necessity. 3. The administration of the Lord's Supper. The command of Christ, 'Do this in remembrance of me' is addressed to all. Moreover the two offices first named are greater matters than the consecration of bread and wine, and the less will surely not be prohibited to him to whom the greater is committed. 4. The binding and loosing of sin, the authority for which is, according to Matt. 18 : 18-20, committed to the entire congregation, and which is nothing more than the proclamation and application of the gospel. 5. The rendering of sacrifice, according to Rom. 12 : 1, and 1 Peter 2 : 5, *i. e.*, the crucifixion of one's own flesh and the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. 6. Priestly intercession for others before God in prayer. 7. Independent judgement of dogmas in the light of the Holy Scriptures. * * * Luther

*Köstlin, Vol. I., pp. 405, 406.

†Vol. II., p. 86.

here endeavors also to base even the authority of the congregation, as such, to call its own ministers, upon these principles touching the universal priesthood. It, says he, every believer has the authority, it certainly cannot be doubted that the congregation, having received the gospel, may and ought to select from its number the one who shall teach the Word in its stead. And, he repeats, just because these things are common to all believers, no one dare press forward in his own authority and violently appropriate to himself that which is the common property of all. It is one thing to exercise this right habitually in public, and another thing to employ it in case of necessity. To exercise it habitually in public is not permitted except with the consent of the whole body, or the Church; in case of necessity, whoever wishes to do so may employ it."

But meanwhile the fanatics had been busy making trouble for Luther, and bringing the Reformation into disrepute by their excesses of various kinds, and justifying themselves by an appeal to the universal priesthood, and especially to 1 Cor. 14 : 30, which Luther had been accustomed to quote in support of this doctrine and his views on the ministry. This led to some modification of his views, or at least led him more carefully to guard the statement of them. Hence Köstlin says of this period, quoting from some of his sermons against the fanatics:* "While insisting upon a regular call (*Berufsein*) for every preacher, he designates two methods of calling, the immediate and the mediate, but traces even the latter back to God himself. The former he will grant in no case unless attested by miracles, even though the preachers laying claim to it manifest otherwise the proper evangelistic spirit. He regards the impression held by such a one as a temptation by which God is testing him to see whether he will abide by the established order. By the mediate call, or the call of God through men, he means that in which the congregation petition (for a regular preacher). * * *

"Luther's conception of the expressions employed by the Apostle in 1 Cor. 14, had thus received a very characteristic

*Vol. II., p. 92.

modification. The "sneaks had planted themselves upon that passage because it appeared to give them authority to pass judgment upon the regular ministers of the churches and to claim an equal right to set up their own preaching against the latter. But, Luther, now, in opposing them, makes a sharp distinction between 'the prophets, who are to teach, and the people (der Poebel) who are to listen.' And he recognizes in the congregation no other prophets than the teachers to whom the ministry of the Word has been formally, permanently, and exclusively committed. Even from these he demands the evidence that they have received such commission through a regular call from their fellowmen, unless they can perform miracles in attestation of their authority. Without such an office, sharply defined and conveyed through an extended call, he grants to no Christian the authority to make any peculiar inner endowment which he may possess productive for the congregation by means of any public teaching whatsoever."

Finally Köstlin sums up Luther's teaching in reference to the ministerial office, as follows: * "The Word, together with the sacraments, has been bestowed upon and committed to the Church by God and Christ. It is the gracious will and requirement of God that the latter, and particularly also the Word, be publicly employed. Preachers are needed, through whom the divine Word may be proclaimed everywhere and constantly, may reach posterity, and may, especially, be presented to the minds of uninstructed youth and the common people. * * * In order that we may have such, God himself endows some men with peculiar talent for such work and points them out to us as suitable persons to undertake it. Thus Christ himself sent out his first great preachers, the inspired apostles, and they, in accordance with the divine will, appointed others to the preaching office. Thus, also, is this office always to continue in the congregation. Such persons, therefore, as are called by the Church, upon her recognition of the divine will and the divine gifts, are really appointed by God. It was only in his later writings that Luther so strenuously maintained that such per-

*Vol. II., p. 545.

sons should therefore be received as *the called of God*, although he then still explained the mediation of the divine through the human calling in the same way as before. We find special emphasis laid also in the later, as compared with the earlier utterances of Luther, upon the gifts, or talents, by the bestowal of which God himself provides for the congregation, or those who control its affairs, men properly endowed. * * * He insists particularly, also, that the pastors or bishops already in the office shall participate in the induction of every new candidate into the ministry. As publicly and regularly appointed witnesses of the divine Word they are thus especially to approve the doctrine of the candidate so ordained, to receive him into their fellowship, and to confirm his appointment by the laying on of hands."

Professor Dieckhoff, of Rostock, in an article translated by Professor A. Martin, A. M., for the *Evangelical Review*,* also calls attention to this change in Luther's position, and makes it even more decided than Köstlin, referring to Luther's pamphlet on *Vagabond's and Corner-preachers* (von Schleichern und Winkelpredigern) Prof. Deickhoff says: "Luther does not now, as in his early theory, establish the right of the office upon the idea that, for the sake of order, the duties and functions which belong to each, but cannot be exercised by all, are delegated to one, in the name and in the place of all. He rather places himself in direct opposition to this theory, by his exposition of I Cor. 14 : 30, from which passage the 'corner-preachers' derived the right for all to preach.

"In order to have the full import of Luther's exposition of this passage, it is necessary to consider that Luther himself deduced his former theory, representing the right of all Christians to preach—the 'ministerium verbi'—from this very passage. But now he says: 'Some, indeed, pretend that St. Paul, in I Cor. 14 : 30, gives to everyone in the congregation authority to preach, and liberty even to bark against the regular preacher.' Luther declares this a false interpretation of the text; and contends that St. Paul here speaks of the 'prophets that are called

*Vol. XXI., p. 182.

to teach' and not of the congregation (Poebel) who should listen. 'But prophets', he says, 'are teachers *who have the office of the ministry in the Church*. Let, therefore, these vagabonds (Schleichern) first show, and prove, that they are prophets, and regularly called and commissioned teachers in the Church; and let them show who has appointed them to this office, and then let them be heard, according to St. Paul's doctrine. * * *

'Let whoever will read the entire chapter; and he will unmistakably find that St. Paul there speaks of prophesying, teaching and preaching in the Church, and *does not command the congregation to preach*; but is dealing with the preachers who are appointed to preach in the congregation.' * * *

Most decidedly does Luther now distinguish between the office of the ministry and the universal priesthood of Christians. * * *

In his exposition of the 110th Psalm (1539) Luther expresses himself still more decidedly, if possible, in regard to the relation between the priesthood of Christians and the office of the ministry. In this commentary Luther treats of the Christian priesthood, and while he endeavors to show that all Christians are priests, he distinguishes the office of the ministry from the priesthood of Christians, as something which does not belong to Christians as such, by virtue of their priesthood. He says: 'Here distinction must be made between the office or service of bishops, clergymen and preachers, on the one hand, and on the other, the common rank of Christians, (*dem gemeinen Christenstand*). Clergymen and preachers are, indeed, in the ecclesiastical office; but they are not therefore *priests*, just as they are not therefore Christians.' 'It is indeed necessary that everyone be first a Christian, a born *priest* before he can become a preacher or bishop; and neither the pope nor any other mortal can make such a priest. But when one has been born a priest in Holy Baptism, then the office is added, and *makes a distinction between him and other Christians*.' Then, after having further treated of the priestly 'sacrifice and prayer' of Christians, Luther continues: 'Behold every Christian has and exercises such functions of priesthood, *but over and above the same is the regular office which teaches in public, and this belongs to clergy-*

men and preachers.' And in his sermons on the 3rd and 4th of the gospel of St. John, Luther now lays special stress upon the truth so inconsistent with his early theory of delegation (*Uebertragungstheorie*), that it is God who sends pastors and teachers, 'John here speaks of *the divine sending*, which however is manifold. He speaks however especially of *the sending of the Son*, and treats of two kinds of sending; first, namely, that God sends his ambassadors (*Leute*) without means, as he sent the prophets and apostles, Moses, and St. Paul. * * * In the New Testament he has discontinued *this sending*; for that of the apostles was the last. That is the high sending which is immediately from God. There is, indeed, another *sending*, which is immediately from God, but is accomplished through men and means, after the office is ordained by God, that there shall be preaching and the use of the keys. That then it is to continue, and there will be no other ministry. But the same persons do not always abide; therefore provision must always be made for new preachers. And that cannot be done without means. The office, such as God's Word, Holy Baptism and the Lord's Supper, is immediately from Christ. But afterwards there is another *sending*, which is through men, but not by men. Thus we are sent, and we again send others, and place them in the office, that they preach and administer the sacraments. And, indeed, this *sending* also is from and by God. For God has commanded it, and by this, his command, *he himself sends laborers into his vineyard*; and yet he does it through men."

Other passages of similar import are quoted by Prof. Deickhoff from Luther's later writings, from which, as he says: "The ministry appears, not as the office and service of the universal priesthood, whereby it accomplishes its functions of worship, sacrifice and divine service before the Lord; but it is the institution, the ministry, the service of Christ, whereby he accomplishes his divine work in the Church."

On the other hand, as over against Deickhoff, it may be said that Professor Kwarau, formerly of Kiel, and now at Breslau,

and who is universally recognized in Germany as, with Köstlin and Kolde, one of the three greatest Luther scholars in the world, in his lectures on *Predigtamt und Kultus*, maintains that Luther never essentially modified the position taken in his earlier writings with reference to the relation between the ministerial office and the universal priesthood. After numerous quotations both from Luther's earlier and also from his later writings, including among the latter his commentary on the 110th Psalm from which Deickhoff quotes so largely in support of his argument that Luther did change radically, Prof. Kawarau sums up the discussion, and sets forth his conception of Luther's view in the following seven propositions:

1. Christ has conferred the office of the keys, *i. e.*, the power and the command to preach the gospel upon the priestly congregation of believers.

2. He himself immediately called the apostles as the first ones to exercise this power (Vollmacht).

3. Since then the congregation calls to the office, but he who receives its regular call may know that he has received a divine call.

4. The office of the ministry is therefore a continuance of the apostolic office, in so far as it administers the same treasury, exercises the same functions, and possesses the same assurance that the minister acts in the name of Christ.

5. At the same time this office, historically considered, derives its power from the congregation, because it administers what has been given to all, and it has its origin in the necessity that what belongs to all must be administered by one.

6. The whole Church (Gesamtheit) orders and calls the persons who are able and trustworthy to the exercise of such functions.

7. Who shall practically exercise this right, which theoretically belongs to the entire congregation, must be left to the historical development of the congregation.*

So much time and space have been given to Luther because

*From manuscript notes of Prof. J. L. Neve, head of the German Department in the Western Theological Seminary.

of the importance which naturally attaches to his name and views, and because he is appealed to on all sides, and by all parties in the Church; also because of the cry of "Back to Luther," which has been so often heard since the celebration of the four hundredth anniversary of his birth in 1883, and because it is well to remember how difficult it is in many cases to know when we are "back to Luther," or just what "Luther" we have gotten back to. It would be well if all controversialists who appeal to Luther were to remember what Prof. Deickhoff says in the article already quoted from, that "it is not necessary that we should take, or elaborate, a complete statement of the doctrine of the office and its relation to the priesthood of believers from the writings of Luther, either earlier or later. It is sufficient that we find the principles which the Lutheran Church embodied in her organization, in her entire history, somewhere expressed by Luther, although the doctrine of the Lutheran Church is not necessarily one and the same thing with the doctrine of Luther."

It has been the custom, in discussing this whole subject of the ministerial office, or the call to the ministry, to quote largely, not only from Luther, but also from the other great Lutheran theologians whose names have been given before, Chemnitz, Gerhard, Quenstedt, etc., and it might naturally be expected that your present lecturer would do the same. It may not be amiss for him to say that he began the work of preparation for the lecture with this plan in view, and that he had collected a large number of such quotations, partly from original sources, and partly from the published work of those who had gone over the same ground before him. But as his preparation progressed he became convinced that this work of collating extracts from the old dogmaticians had been done so often and so well, and that the results are so easily available to anyone who cares to study the subject from this standpoint, that it seemed to be a work of supererogation to repeat the task.*

*For the information of any who are interested, the following books and articles are named, besides the original works of the theologians,

Having gone over the ground as carefully as his time would permit, and studied these authors comparatively, it has seemed to him that it would be sufficient, and far more practical, to endeavor to sum up their teaching, as clearly as possible, in a series of brief thetical propositions. This has been done with the following results:

1. The Christian ministry is not a heirarchical order in the Church, such as was the Aaronic priesthood in the Jewish Church, but a public office of service instituted by Christ himself, and committed to the Church as a whole for the public preaching of the Word and the administration of the sacraments.

2. Though this office is closely associated with the universal priesthood of believers, and is sometimes spoken of by Luther and others, as if it were a mere delegation to a few, for the sake of order, of the rights and privileges which really belong to all, or the universal priesthood in function, it is still not to be identified with the universal priesthood, but is a divinely appointed office in the Church different from and additional to the universal priesthood.

3. As taught in the Fourteenth Article of the Confession, no one has the right publicly to preach the Word or administer the sacraments in the Church, without a regular call; but the necessity for such a regular call is not absolute but relative, and hence in cases of extreme need, as when the regular ministry is not available, or proves unfaithful, or when a man is dying, a

most of which are easily accessible to English readers: *The Ministry*, by Prof. M. Loy, Columbus, Ohio, 1870; *The Pastor*, by Prof. H. Ziegler, D. D.; *The Evangelical Pastor*, by Dr. E. T. Horn, Philadelphia, 1887; Dr. Walther's *Kirche und Amt.*, St. Louis, 1853; *The Theology of Luther*, by Köstlin, Translated by Dr. Chas. E. Hay, 2 Vols; Dr. C. A. Hay's Lecture on Art. V., Augsburg Confession, First Series; Dr. L. A. Gotwald's Lecture on Art. XIV., Augsburg Confession, First Series; Art. by Dr. H. E. Jacobs in *LUTHERAN QUARTERLY*, Vol. IV., p. 557; Art. by Dr. J. A. Brown in *LUTH. QUART.*, III., 93, and VI., 81; Arts. by Dr. S. A. Ort, in *LUTH. QUART.*, VI., 249, 612 and VII., 242; Arts. by Dr. F. W. Conrad, in *LUTH. QUART.*, XII., 583, and XIV., 202. Also numerous other articles in the *Evangelical Review* and *LUTHERAN QUARTERLY*, by Stoevecr, Dox, Fink, Plitt, and others.

private Christian may exercise the functions of the ministry without a regular or formal call.

4. The regular call to the ministry comes primarily from God himself, and is either immediate or mediate. The immediate call is direct from God, as in the case of Moses and the prophets and apostles, and is usually attested by miracles. The mediate call is given through human instrumentality, *i. e.*, through the Church, but it is not on this account any the less truly from God.

5. Since the days of the Apostles no immediate call is given, or to be expected, but God does even now endows certain persons with the gifts requisite for the ministry, thus indicating to the Church who are the proper persons to be called. He may produce in such persons a conviction that they are divinely called to this office and work, and this conviction may be regarded as, in a modified sense, a direct inner call. But such inner call must always be approved and ratified by the external mediate call through the Church, which is the true "rite vocatus" of the Fourteenth Article.

6. The mediate call through the Church must come from the Church as a whole, consisting of ministers and laymen, and where church and state are united, of the Christian magistrates also. Ordinarily, it belongs to the people to elect, and to the ministry to examine and ordain, and where church and state are united it is the privilege and duty of the magistracy to appoint or confirm.

7. Ordination is not a sacrament, in the true sense of the word, but is a solemn rite introduced by the apostles and retained in the Church, and though not absolutely necessary to validate the call received from the Church, it is important as a public certification that the one ordained has been regularly called to the office and work of the ministry. In ordination no special grace is conferred *ex opere operato*, but in answer to prayer the Holy Ghost is given in proportion to the receptivity and faith of the ordainers and the one ordained.

8. No one should be ordained who has not been called to a definite congregation, or to some specific work in the Church, as

a foreign missionary; though ordination is not for a limited time, as during the pastoral charge of a specified congregation, it does not confer an indelible character, or permanent ministerial rank, as taught by the Romanists. The ministry, therefore, may be demitted, or an unworthy minister may be deposed, and when a minister ceases to perform the functions of the office, whether voluntarily or by deposition, he ceases to be a minister, and differs in nothing from an ordinary layman.

These propositions have been prepared, and are submitted by your lecturer, with great diffidence. He fully realizes that it becomes him to go softly over a field on which so many theological giants have contended in the past, are still contending to-day. He is well aware also that not all of these propositions will be endorsed by all who may hereafter read them, nor even by all who hear them to-day. But he at least has the consciousness of having honestly tried to reach an impartial conclusion, and to state such conclusion as clearly as possible and without any partisan bias. If he is disagreed with by some, or even by many, or even if his statements should be hotly controverted, he will be in the company of many great and good men who have shared a similar fate in discussing this same question, one of the most difficult and perplexing in the whole range of Lutheran theology, or church polity.

The remainder of the lecture will be devoted to a comparative study of the views held by the several bodies of Lutherans in this country, in so far as they are available, under the belief that this will prove more interesting and profitable to those addressed than any further discussion of the views held by our Lutheran Fathers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Chronologically such a discussion would naturally begin with the General Synod, which is by far the oldest general body of Lutherans in the United States, having celebrated the seventy-fifth anniversary of its organization at the meeting held in Hagerstown, Maryland, six years ago.

But historically our attention is drawn, rather, first, to the controversy between the Missourians and Buffalonians and Iowans, which began some sixty years ago, and which first

called general attention to this question among the Lutherans of this country.

This controversy took its rise from a pastoral letter (*Hirten-brief*) addressed by Rev. J. A. A. Grabau, in 1840, to a number of German pastors and congregations who had emigrated to this country from Germany the year before to escape from the persecutions of the Prussian government for refusing to become members of the United State Church of Prussia, and had settled in or near to Buffalo, New York. This letter was intended to warn the congregations to which it was addressed against unworthy ministers. By way of enforcing this warning, Pastor Grabau discussed quite fully the doctrine of the Church, and especially of the ministry and the "rite vocatus" required by the Confession, Article Fourteen; and also the kind and degree of authority which the pastor may exercise in and over the congregation. On all these points he took very high ground, maintaining, among other things, that a pastor who had not been called according to the old Lutheran orders was not a true minister and had no right to exercise the office of a minister, that such a pastor had no right to grant absolution, and that if he should administer the Lord's Supper it would be no true sacrament, but simply bread and wine, etc.. He also maintained that the people were bound to obey the pastor in all things not contrary to God's Word, even in matters of business, etc.

He further emphasized the following five things as essential to a proper call:

"1. That the one called should not only be able to properly administer the sacraments, but that he must have a thorough knowledge of them, by whom and for what they are given, and why they are celebrated as they are, etc.

"2. The gifts of the Holy Spirit, enabling a man to use his knowledge rightly in admonishing, warning, etc.

"3. That a man be examined, or proved, by tried and worthy servants of the Church.

"4. That he be publicly ordained, and

"5. Installed in the congregation to which he has been called."

You will observe that ordination is made an essential part of

a regular call, and Pastor Grabau insisted that ordination confers not only the right, but also the power, to execute the office of a minister effectively. He further insisted that no congregation should be allowed to call a minister without the coöperation of the synodical ministerium.*

A copy of this letter was sent to the Saxon ministers in Missouri, afterwards known as the "Missourians" and they were invited to give their opinion in reference to it, which they did in due time. But, in most points, their views differed very materially from those of Grabau, and in some important matters they were diametrically opposed to him. Their views of the office of the ministry, and of the call, and of church government, seem at that time to have been fashioned after some of the most extreme utterances of Luther in his earliest writings, and embodied an extreme congregationalism. Hence they were not at all satisfactory to Grabau, and called forth from him a very severe rejoinder, which was again answered in like spirit. Thus there arose a very bitter controversy, which continued for several years, and was finally transferred to the synods of Buffalo and Missouri when they were organized, the first in 1845, and the second in 1846.

This discussion resulted in the clearer and fuller definition of the views of the Missourians, which seem to have undergone some modification during the discussion, and they were given expression in a series of nine theses on the Church, and ten on the ministry which were adopted about 1851. These theses form the basis of Dr. Walther's *Kirche und Amt* so frequently referred to in subsequent discussions of these questions. As this deliverance is official, and represents the extreme congregational view of the ministerial office and call, held among Lutherans in this country, the ten theses on these two topics are quoted in full:

"1. The holy ministry or pastorship is an office different from the priesthood, which belongs to all Christians.

*See Lutheran Cyclopedia, Synods V. Also Wolf's Lutherans in America, p. 413, *et seqq.* Ev. Rev. Vol. IV., p. 413, *et seqq.* MS. Lectures on American Church History by Prof. J. L. Neve, Western Theological Seminary.

"2. The ministry is not a human ordinance, but an office instituted by God himself.

"3. The ministry is not an optional office, but one whose establishment has been enjoined upon the Church, and to which the Church is ordinarily obligated to the end of time.

"4. The ministry is not a peculiar order of superior holiness, standing in contrast with the common order of Christians, as the Levitical priesthood did, but is an office that serves others.

"5. The ministry has the power of preaching the gospel and administering the sacraments, and the powers of a spiritual court.

"6. The ministry is conferred by God, through the congregation, which possesses all Church power, or the power of the keys, and through its call, given in the manner prescribed by God. Ordination by the imposition of hands upon such as have been called, is not of divine appointment, but is an apostolic and churchly ordinance, and only a public and solemn confirmation of the call.

"7. The holy ministry is the delegated power to exercise all the rights of the spiritual priesthood in a public office for the common good, which power is conferred by God through the congregation as the possessor of the priesthood and of all ecclesiastical power.

"8. The ministerial office is the highest office in the Church, and from it all others are derived.

"9. The ministry is entitled to reverence, and to unconditional obedience when the preacher proclaims God's Word, but has no lordship in the Church, and has, therefore, no right to enact laws, arbitrarily to establish matters of indifference, and ceremonies in the Church, or to threaten or inflict excommunication without the previous knowledge of the congregation.

"10. To the ministry also belongs, of divine right, the office of judging doctrines, but the laity have likewise the same right, and are therefore entitled to sit and vote in church councils and synods."*

*See *Evangelical Review*, Vol IV., pp. 430, 431.

One of the most important contributors to the growth of the Missouri Synod, in its earliest years, was the evangelical and devout pastor William Loehe, of Neuendettelsau, in Germany. Through his efforts a society was formed as early as 1841 to train young men and send them to America as missionaries. Quite a number of these had become associated with the Missourians, but when the controversy between Grabau and the Missourians waxed warm, Loehe was soon drawn into it, as his sympathies were with Grabau rather than with Missouri. This led first to friction, and then later to separation, as the Missourians refused to hold fellowship with Loehe and his pupils. As, however, these latter could not entirely accept the heirarchical position of Grabau and the Buffalonians, they were rejected by these also, and this resulted in the formation of a new synod, the German Synod of Iowa, organized in 1854.

Loehe and his students occupied a kind of middle ground in reference to this question of the ministry. Loehe had himself especially emphasized these three points:*

1. The office of the ministry is a calling wholly different from the universal priesthood. As a matter of course, the private Christian should pray, bear testimony to the truth, as over against the world, lead family worship, etc., but he has no authority to celebrate the sacraments, nor to bind and absolve.

2. The congregation, therefore, does not confer its rights when it calls a pastor, but God uses the congregation as an organ, or instrument, through which to confer upon the pastor an office which he never gave to the congregation.

3. The calling of a pastor should, only in exceptional cases, come from the congregation alone, without the coöperation of the officers of synod.

The views of the Iowa Synod are stated thus by Dr. S. Fritschel: "The Iowa Synod rejected the view according to which the ministerial office is derived from the visible Church, that it is originally vested in the individual members of the same in their spiritual priesthood, and by them conferred upon

*For some account of Loehe's views and of the difference between him and the Missourians, see *Ev. Rev.*, Vol. IV., p. 564 *et seq.*

the ministers of the Church through their vocation to the holy office. The Iowa Synod agreed with Missouri in so far as it taught that the holy office was originally and directly given by God to the Church, but differed from Missouri in so far as it maintained that the office was given to the Church in its totality, not to its single members, and that the Church possessed the office in and with the means of grace, not in the spiritual priesthood and in the state of grace of its true members. And if the conferring of the office takes place in accordance with a regular call by a single congregation, it is not on account of the true members of the invisible Church that may be hidden in it, but because the Church, which in its totality possesses the office, and which is as well invisible communion of the spirit as visible communion of the means of grace, is in its totality and essence existing even in the smallest individual congregation, where two or three are met together in the name of Jesus."*

The controversy between the three synods already referred to awakened considerable interest throughout the Lutheran Church in America, and even in Germany. Especially were those bodies in the United States interested in which the German language was generally used, because they naturally had more access to the literature developed than the English speaking bodies. The Joint Synod of Ohio made an official deliverance on the subject at its sessions in 1868 and 1870, in the form of seven carefully prepared theses. These theses present a view of the ministerial office and of the call to the ministry, still less hierarchical than that of Iowa, and yet not quite so democratic as that of Missouri. They make the office of the ministry to be at once a divine institution, and the work of the spiritual priesthood, and so do not make the former a mere transfer of the latter. They also emphasize the importance of ordination more strongly than Missouri does.

The theses are as follows :

"1. There is in the Christian Church a universal priesthood which consists in this, that all Christian people have the right

**Distinctive Doctrines and Usages, etc.*, p. 69.

and duty to show forth the praises of him who has called them out of darkness into his marvelous light.

"2. But there is also in the Church a public office instituted by God, usually called the pastoral office (Pfarramt) to publicly preach the gospel, to administer the sacraments, also to exercise Christian discipline and order in the congregation.

"3. There is a difference between the evangelical pastoral office (Pfarramt) and the universal priesthood, for the priestly calling of all Christians must not be confounded with this office of service (dienstlichen Beruf) in the congregation. This difference does not consist in that the public ministry (Predigtamt) has another Word, Baptism, Absolution and Lord's Supper, to administer in the Church. On the contrary all believing Christians have, according to their priestly calling, the right and duty, without a public call, to be occupied with the Word of God, and also, in case of necessity, to baptize and absolve.

"4. The Church, *i. e.*, all Christians, have the keys originally and immediately from Christ, and are possessors of the spiritual priesthood; but it does not follow from this that every Christian is a pastor.

"5. The pastoral office is not a human arrangement, but a divine institution, although its establishment (Aufrichtung) is a work of the spiritual priesthood.

"6. The call to the pastoral office comes from God, but not immediately, as with the prophets and apostles, but mediately through men, *i. e.*, through the Christian congregation.

"7. Ordination, strictly speaking, is no divine requirement, but it has been the practice of the Church, since the time of the apostles; it is not absolutely necessary but is an ecclesiastical necessity (kirchlich nothwendig). It does not convey official gifts (Amtsgaben), yet it is a blessed confirmation of the call through the Church, (which ought to proceed according to the existing order in the Church); and in the normal state of the Church ordination should be conducted by those already in the pastoral office."*

*Geschichte der Synods von Ohio, by Peter and Schmidt, 1900, pp. 192, 303.

Those who are familiar with Prof. M. Loy's excellent little book on *The Ministry*, published in 1870, and especially those who have read the article on *The Ministerial Office*, in the *Evangelical Review* for January 1860, (Vol. III., p. 311) by Professor D. Worley, both of the institutions at Columbus, Ohio, will know that even in so strictly confessional a body as the Ohio Synod an official deliverance does not necessarily express the views, or carry the convictions of every member of the body.

Hence, in turning now to examine the views obtaining in the General Synod, which so far as your lecturer knows, has never given forth any official statement on the subject, we need not be surprised to find considerable diversity of opinions. It is true that the General Synod has adopted the Augsburg Confession as a part of its doctrinal basis, which would, of course, carry with it the approval of the two articles which deal with the office of the ministry, and the Call, the Fifth and the Fourteenth. But it has already become apparent that the adoption of the Augsburg Confession, and even of all the other symbolical books, according to the strictest sect of Lutherans, still allows room for a great variety, and very wide divergence of views, in reference to both the office of the ministry and the "rite vocatus." Thus we have the extreme hierarchical views of the Buffalo Synod, and the extreme democracy or congregationalism of the Missouri Synod, and the moderate hierarchical teaching of Iowa and the moderate congregationalism of Ohio, all most strenuously held, and insisted on, by those who are so strictly loyal to all the confessional writings of the Church that they will have no fellowship whatever with each other, nor with anyone else who differs with them in even the smallest particulars.

Inasmuch as we have no official deliverance from the General Synod on the subject under consideration, the only available plan to get at the teaching among us seems to be to present a digest of the views of the professors in our leading seminaries.

Naturally enough we begin with the views that have been taught, and are now being taught in the seminary here at Gettysburg. If we go back and begin with the first professor, Dr.

S. S. Schmucker of blessed memory, we shall find, what need not at all surprise us under the circumstances, that his views were considerably tinged with Puritanism, and that not much emphasis is laid on any of the points which are peculiar to our own Church. In his *Popular Theology*, beginning with page 218, under the caption "Of Ministers," we find the following: "The views of the Lutheran Church touching the ministerial office may be embraced in the following features:

"a. This office was instituted by divine authority, and all Christians are bound to regard faithful ministers as servants of Christ and messengers of God.

"b. All the incumbents of this office are, by divine appointment, of equal rank. (This point is developed very fully).

"c. No man has a right to assume this office without a regular call, Rom. 10 : 15. This call may be divided into internal and external. By the former is meant the conviction of the individual that God has designed him for this office. This conviction is not at the present day produced in an immediate, extraordinary or miraculous manner, as in the case of the ancient apostles and prophets. God has prescribed a regular mode, according to which the ministry is to be perpetuated, and we have no right to expect a needless deviation from it. These ordinary evidences of a call are, first, *undoubted piety*, John 3 : 3; Luke 6 : 39; secondly, at least mediocrity of talents, 1 Tim. 3 : 2; thirdly, a desire or at least an ultimate willingness to serve God in the ministry, Matt. 4 : 20, 22; and fourthly, *the coöperation of divine providence* by the removal of all insuperable difficulties. * * * By the latter, or external call, is intended the regular induction of an individual into the ministerial office by one, Titus, 1 : 5, or if possible several, 1 Tim. 4 : 14, existing ministers, with prayer and the laying on of hands, or, as it is usually termed, by ordination."

You will observe that there is nothing here about the universal priesthood, and nothing about the rights of the congregation, and that the external call is practically made identical with ordination. The main stress is laid on the internal call, piety and providential co-operation.

We pass now to Dr. James A. Brown, my own revered instructor, to whom I am under many obligations, and for whose great ability and learning all his students had the profoundest respect. His early training had also been received under Puritan influences, and this had probably somewhat influenced his views on some phases of church life and polity, but his views on the subject in hand were mainly in accord with those of Luther and the dogmaticians as already expressed. There is still perhaps, a lack of due emphasis on the universal priesthood, in connection with the office of the ministry, and of the rights of the congregation in giving the call, but both these are recognized. Quoting from his *Lectures on Church Polity*, as dictated to his students, and dropping for the sake of convenience and brevity, the catechetical form of question and answer in which they were given we have the following statements: "The theory or doctrine of the ministry has been, and still is, a point of much dispute. The different views have ranged from that of a hierarchy, on the one hand, to what may be called democracy on the other. In the New Testament Church the ministry was not, apart from the apostles, a well defined and separate order of men. There were ministers of the Word and ordinances, but the universal priesthood of believers was then a practical truth, and yet there was a line of distinction. The general truth, that of the ministerial office, is clearly enough contained in the New Testament, Matt. 28 : 19, 20 ; 2 Tim. 2 : 2 ; and this resulted in a fixed ministry ; and the ministry as an office, but not as an order, we hold to be of divine institution.

"The office was supplied :

"1. By divine call, 1 Cor. 12 : 28 ; Eph. 4 : 11 ; 1 Tim. 4 : 14 ; Col 4 : 17 ; 2 Cor. 3 : 6-9.

"2. By a solemn setting apart to the work, 1 Tim. 4 : 14 ; 5 : 22 ; 2 Tim 1 : 16. This last was not a necessity, but has apostolic sanction and is in every way desirable."

"The Lutheran view of ordination may be stated thus :

"1. That no one should officiate publicly, or administer the sacraments, unless duly called and set apart, (Augsburg Confession Article XIV) on account of the general teaching of the

sacred Scriptures, good order, sound doctrine, and the satisfaction both of ministers and people.

"2. That churches have the right to call and ordain their own pastors. Schmalcald Articles, Art. X. and Appendix to the same.

"3. That for the sake of order and propriety this duty is entrusted to duly authorized bodies, as ministeriums or synods.

"4. That the solemn laying on of hands with prayer and other appropriate services is retained according to apostolic and ancient usage.

"This solemn responsibility [of ordination] may be most appropriately entrusted by the Church to the ministerium, because :

"1. Being a delegated power it can as well be delegated to a ministerium as to a synod.

"2. Ministers are best qualified to judge of the qualifications of those who should be admitted to the ministry.

"3. Ministers, in the Lutheran Church, alone have any corresponding obligations resting upon them."*

The true Lutheran view comes out much more clearly and strongly in Dr. C. A. Hay's *Lectures on Pastoral Theology*.† Under the head of "qualifications of the pastor," after insisting earnestly on "genuine piety" as the first requisite, he continues :

"As the second item in the list of qualifications for the holy ministry we enumerate *the Divine Call*.

"Surely no one should undertake so special a work as that of the gospel ministry without having been specially called to it. Rom. 10 : 15.

"This call is either mediate or immediate. The first preachers of the gospel were *immediately called* by the Master himself. Matt. 4 : 19; 29 : 10. This immediate call was accompanied by the gift of the power to work miracles, Luke 10 : 19. This gift was necessary in the beginning of the Church's history, but was withheld, together with the immediate call, when the Church

*For a fuller presentation of Dr. Brown's views upon this last point, and upon the general subject, see articles in the *QUARTERLY REVIEW*, Vol. III., p. 93; and Vol. VI., p. 81.

†As dictated to his students.

was firmly established. Any persons now claiming to have an immediate call to the ministry may properly be required to furnish evidence thereof by their ability to perform miracles as a divine attestation of their claims.

"The *mediate call* to the ministry is a twofold summons by the Holy Spirit, viz., (1.) through the divine Word; and (2.) through the Church.

"1. The Holy Spirit through the application of the truth to the heart and conscience, awakens in the soul an ardent longing for the privilege of persuading men to be reconciled to God, an inner impulse to go forth to break the bread of life to those who are perishing for lack of knowledge. * * * Nor is this desire easily quenched by difficulties and discouragements that may oppose its accomplishment. * * *

"2. This mediate call by the Holy Spirit through the truth, is followed by another call of the same spirit *through the Church*. To the Church, the whole Church, has been committed the duty of setting apart those who shall serve her in word and doctrine, Acts. 1 : 15, 22 : 23; 1 John 4 : 1.

"3. The Church built upon this truth is, at the same time, the pillar and ground of the truth, *i. e.*, she is set to defend and preserve it. To do this she must have the power to choose for herself sound and faithful teachers, and to reject those who corrupt the divine Word, 1 Peter 2 : 5; Rev. 1 : 5, 6. Here we are taught the royal priesthood of all true believers, and this the Church exercises by such of her members as she calls and sets apart for the work of the ministry. * * * This formal setting apart she executes by the hands of those already in the sacred office, whom she has already called and acknowledged as overseers of the flock, and who are expressly charged to lay hands suddenly on no man.

"No call to the ministry is complete unless thus sanctioned by a direct, or indirect, endorsement on the part of the Church. Ordination is the public and official setting apart of a member of the Church to the work of the ministry by the laying on of hands of the Presbytery, *i. e.*, of those already in the sacred

office. * * * It should never be performed unless the person seeking it has already been specially called by some particular church to become its pastor, for its true import is the official recognition and endorsement of just such a special external call. The only allowable exceptional case is that of those who are called and set apart by the Church for special missionary work, (*ordinatio sine titulo*)."

Still more clearly and positively Lutheran, if possible, are the views taught by the present occupant of the chair of Ecclesiastical Theology in this Seminary, showing how steady and healthful has been the development here, and in the General Synod, towards a true Lutheran consciousness, and a positive and hearty understanding and acceptance of the evangelical faith of our Church.

In his *Lectures on Symbolics** Dr. Richard says:†

"The Church is an organized body. It has its parts and offices. What may be the right of every one is not necessarily the duty of every one. The office of the ministry does not vacate the universal priesthood of believers, neither does this latter take away the necessity for the office of the ministry. Order and efficiency in preaching the gospel and in administering the sacraments requires the office of pastor and teacher. But those who exercise this office do not constitute a class of persons different from other Christians. The chief emphasis must be placed on the words: 'teach and preach publicly in the Church.' It is the public ministerial function which is guarded by the Confession. No one should undertake to discharge this public function without an orderly call.

"The 'orderly call' has reference to the *mediate call*, or the call mediated through properly qualified persons, 1 Tim. 3 : 1 ; Titus 1 : 5. In this way God is the author of pastors and teachers in the Church, Eph. 4 : 2. The Ephesian elders were constituted pastors by the Holy Ghost, Acts 20 : 28. But this 'orderly call' belongs to the entire Church, not to any one part of it, because

*Second Cyclostyled Edition, p. 119, *et. seqq.*; see also p. 86 under Art. V., Augsburg Confession.

†All citations from authorities given by Dr. Richard in his lectures are omitted from these extracts.

the office of the keys belongs to the entire Church, Matt. 18 : 18, 19.

"The call properly includes ordination, or the formal dedication of a person to the office of the ministry which is usually performed by the ministry in the name of the church, by the laying on of hands, 1 Tim. 4 : 14."

We quote also from Dr. Richard's *Lectures on Church Polity*,* under "The Ministry of the Church," the following :

"The call to the ministry is twofold, *immediate* and *mediate*. In the Old Testament God called men to be prophets and preachers *immediately*, that is, without human intervention. Witness the call of Moses, Ex. 3 : 4-15; Jeremiah, Jer. 1 : 4-7; Ezekiel, Ez. 2 : 3. In the New Testament apostles were called immediately by Christ, Matt. 10 : 1. Paul was called immediately by Jesus Christ and by God the Father, Gal. 1 : 1. His call was not in any sense mediated by human instrumentality. Under the new dispensation the difference between apostles [and ordinary ministers of the Word] is especially prominent in the nature of the call. The call to be an apostle was special, and the work of an apostle was special. The special call ceased with the special character of the work. Hence the apostles had no official successors, neither is there such a thing as an apostolic succession of bishops in the Church. Those ordained by the apostles, as Timothy and Titus, were ordinary ministers of the Word and of the sacraments.

"Our Church and its teachers maintain, with one accord, that the right, power and duty of calling ministers, resides with the Church as a whole. * * * But as regards the divine character of the call our teachers make no difference, since whether immediate or mediate, it is equally from God, and has promises of divine favor, although a preëminence belongs to those immediately called."

Under the subject of "ordination," through which Dr. Richard says that "the special and lawful call is made known," Gerhard's definition of ordination is adopted ; "Ordination is a solemn and public declaration or testimony by which the ministry of the

*Second Cyclostyled Edition.

Church is committed by the Church to a person suited to it. In this ministry the person is consecrated by prayer and the laying on of hands, is certified of his lawful call, and is solemnly and earnestly admonished of his duty publicly in the presence of the Church, wherefore we preserve inviolate the rite of ordination in our churches."

Dr. Richard then continues: "Against the absolute necessity of ordination, as taught by the Roman Catholic Church, our theologians teach that it is not *absolutely* necessary, but that it must be retained in accordance with apostolic and ancient customs. The Scriptures on which it rests are, Acts, 6 : 6, 13 : 3 ; 1 Tim. 4 : 14, 22 ; 2 Tim. 1 : 6. But these are not direct divine commands. Our teachers also reject the idea that ordination imparts *character indelebilis*, or that it confers gifts *ex opere operato*, by which the work of the ministry is performed, as the Romanists insist."

In criticism of the views of Loehe, the founder indirectly of the German Iowa Synod, he says: "A very unlutheran view of the ministry is that of Rev. William Loehe of New Dettelsau, Germany. * * * The logic of the Loehean theory of the ministry is *sacerdotalism*, that is, that the ministry is essentially a priesthood, and that the efficiency of the sacraments is determined by their administration through the priesthood."

In reference to the examination of candidates, and their actual induction into the office of the ministry, Dr. Richard says: "But while we claim for the entire Church the right and power of calling and ordaining the ministry, yet for the sake of good order, and as a matter of eminent fitness, the examination and induction of candidates into the sacred office should be conducted by the clergy. * * * They who have the office should induct others into it, not by a prescriptive right, but because of the law of fitness. Our Church teachers are generally agreed on this point. And such has been the practice of our Church throughout her history."

You will observe that nothing is said by Dr. Richard about the necessity of a call from a specified local congregation to become its pastor, prior to ordination. With this exception his

views are in substantial agreement with the doctrine of the call held by the Missourians.

Attention may also be called here to the views of Dr. E. J. Wolf of this Seminary, as presented at the General Conference of Lutherans in Philadelphia, in 1899, and reported on pp. 246, 7 of the Proceedings of the Conference. He is there reported as saying "that the individual congregation, and not the synod or ministerium, has the exclusive right of calling a man and thereby making him a minister. He did not believe in a special grace or charism being conveyed by the laying on of clerical hands. * * * He challenged the right of any body of men to ordain a candidate until he presented a call from some congregation, or, it may be, a mission board. * * * He also claimed that when a man ceased official ministrations he practically ceased to be a minister. * * * Lutheran theology recognizes no distinction between a layman and a so-called clergyman, unless the latter fills the office of preaching the gospel and administering the sacraments." This is congregationalism of the extremest type, and ought to satisfy the most radical advocates of the doctrine of the ministry and the call held by the Missourians. Indeed, it is a question whether the Missourians themselves would go so far as this.

We now turn to Wittenberg Seminary at Springfield, Ohio. So far as we have been able to learn, Dr. Samuel Sprecher, who for so many years taught almost the whole course in this institution, did not deliver any formal lectures covering the subjects under consideration, but used Knapp's Theology as a guide, or basis, freely commenting on the text.

Knapp's views are, no doubt, well known. He holds that the Christian office of teaching was instituted, or appointed by Christ. The apostles and evangelists were immediately called by Christ himself. Of other offices and teachers, not appointed immediately by Christ, he says:* "In the early Church they were not always appointed in the same way and by the same persons; certainly no rule was given respecting this point which should be binding in all places and at all times. * * * But

**Knapp's Christian Theology*, p. 477.

all these teachers and overseers, appointed either by the churches or their rulers and representatives, were regarded in the New Testament as appointed by God, or the Holy Ghost, or Christ, *e. g.*, Acts 20 : 28 ; Col. 4 : 17 ; because their consecration took place on his authority, and according to his will." Ordination is commended as "useful both to the teacher himself and to the Church ; but in itself considered it is not a matter *juris divini* ; it is nowhere expressly commanded by God, and contributes nothing, considered as an external ceremony, to activity and efficiency in the sacred office. * * * It can be performed by anyone who is commissioned to do it by the Church, or by their functionaries and representatives." Of course the fact that Dr. Sprecher used Knapp's Theology as a text book does not, by any means, carry with it the implication that he approved of all Knapp's views. His opposition to the ministerium, as organized in connection with most of our synods, is well known, and this would indicate a tendency towards a low, or democratic, view of the ministry as an office, and also of the call.

Dr. L. A. Gotwald, who was the first regular professor in the chair of Practical Theology at Wittenberg, has treated the whole subject at great length in his *Lectures on Church Polity*.* The fact that Dr. Gotwald's views differ, in some important points, from those taught by his successor, and though rejecting all sacerdotalism, incline more to the position held by Loehe and the Iowa Synod, seems to justify, and require, a somewhat full and careful statement of them.

I. On the relation of the office of the ministry to the universal priesthood he takes decided ground against the theory of a mere delegation of rights and functions (*uebertragungstheorie*) apparently taught by Luther in his earlier writings. He says : "Among the things left behind, or discarded by the apostles, in the organization of the New Testament Church, was the sacerdotal or priestly ministry. The break in this respect between

*The writer is indebted to Rev. J. N. Lentz for a most excellent manuscript copy of these lectures as dictated to his students by Dr. Gotwald, from which all extracts are made.

the old and new, is both abrupt and complete. The name priest (*ιερεὺς*) is never once even named among the New Testament Church offices. The common priestly function now belonging to all believers is not sacerdotal at all in the Old Testament sense of a priesthood, and is not indeed an office at all.

"What we call the universal priesthood of believers is rather simply an individual privilege, a characteristic of all Christians, as Christians, by virtue of which, or because of their union with Christ, through him as the one and only Mediator, or Priest, between God and man, they can personally and directly, without the mediation of a human priesthood, offer their spiritual sacrifices to God.

"And here a great point becomes apparent, viz., that as the term priests now applied to all believers refers so evidently to no sacerdotal functions whatever, and means no special office whatever, the ministry cannot, as some have maintained, be resolved simply into a delegation by the Christian community of certain priestly functions to those whom we call ministers. That is, there is, independent of the universal priesthood of believers, the ministerial office. Though in connection with a universal priesthood, the office of the ministry is different from the priesthood. It was instituted in entire disconnection with all real sacerdotalism, and since it means, largely, the preaching of a crucified Saviour, it is an office that has in it more than the common priesthood of believers involves."

II. Under the topic "The Manner of Appointment of Elders in the Primitive Church," he says again: "This brings us to the heart of the contested ground in the doctrine of the ministry. The question which here presents itself is: Whose right is it to call men into the ministry? Is the choice and appointment with the Church, as such, *i. e.*, with the organized body of believers including ministers and laity, or is the ministry a self-perpetuating body, having in itself alone the sole right of the choice and appointment of men to the ministry?"

After examining at length all the Scripture passages bearing on this point, he continues: "There is no express statement, or assertion, that the people did really choose their presbyters; yet,

on the other hand, the possibility that they did must also be admitted. There is room, therefore, for honest difference of opinion upon this point. * * * In our Lutheran Church it has always been an open, or undecided question, whether the power to choose men and induct them into the ministerial office belongs democratically to the Church as an organic whole, or aristocratically to the ministry exclusively. * * *

"We reach then certain conclusions, and among them the following :

"1. That the appointment to the ministry is not shown to belong by absolute divine authority to those who are in the ministry, or that a self-perpetuating presbytery is the only scriptural method of teaching. In some way the right of the Church, as the Church, must be acknowledged in the mode of appointment. The authority of the call, primarily, is of course from God, mediately through the Church.

"2. That in view of the principle that the ministry is a chosen representative of the Church in a given and properly defined relation, presbyters acting for the Church in synodical capacity or as a ministerium, may properly, by the consent of the Church, express the Church's choice in the call of men to the ministry. In such cases the ministry act, not personally, or from themselves simply as ministers, but representatively and with delegated authority for the Church.

"In our modern system which ordains men to the ministry as an office, not simply for a local pastorate but for the general service of the Church wherever a congregation may call them, this representative and delegated call and ordination seem eminently proper, and seem almost the only feasible method.

"3. The so-called ministerium may properly represent the Church in this appointment of men to the ministry. This may be done, not on the ground of exclusive or inherent divine right, on the part of the presbytery alone, to appoint successors in the ministry, but on the principle of delegation, and on the ground of expediency.

"The appointment, in the system adopted in the Church, is for the Church in general, and not for the local congregation,

and is therefore made by a delegated body representing the general Church; and since it is thus made for the Church at large, not directly by the Church herself, but by a delegated and representative body from the Church, this delegated or representative body should consist of those best qualified to act wisely and safely for the Church in this capacity. That the ministry is the best qualified to act in this capacity can scarcely be a question. * * * Not a synod, therefore, composed of laymen as well as ministers, but purely a ministerium, a presbytery, composed only of ministers, ought to compose such delegated body.

"4. That the act of ordination, strictly so called, belongs of course to the body of presbyters, and to them alone. The rite of formally inducting the accepted candidate into office is distinctly declared to be 'the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.' Acts, 6 : 6, 14 : 23 ; 1 Tim. 4 : 4."

Dr. Gotwald's discussion of this last point is exceedingly interesting and important as being the only formal attempt, of which we know, to explain and defend the method of calling and ordaining men to the ministry so generally followed in the General Synod, namely, by the action of the synod, or ministerium, without requiring in every case, or indeed in any case, a prior call from a local congregation. The question may be raised, does he make out his case, and is his position sound? It seems to us that his position is a sound one and that his argument is valid. It proceeds upon the principle so clearly recognized by Prof. Kawarau in the seventh of the theses already quoted (see p. 470) when he says: "Who shall practically exercise this right of calling men into the ministry which theoretically belongs to the entire congregation, must be left to the historical development of the congregation." The same principle seems to be recognized also by the Ohio Synod when they say of ordination that it "ought to proceed according to the existing order in the Church." We may quote also, in support of this principle, a remark made by Prof. Theodosius Harnack in his

Kirchen-Regiment when, after discussing ordination, which he declares to be "no sacrament, but an act of benediction which presupposes and confirms the inner spiritual dedication, and in which the Church publicly attests and ratifies the call to the ministry in general," he continues: "The installation imparts the rights to exercise his spiritual calling in a particular congregation. The old principle; 'Nemo ordinatur sine titulo,' no longer corresponds with the present wants of the Church."*

Luther and the dogmaticians certainly recognized the same principle practically, whether they ever did it theoretically or not, when they gave to the magistracy a part, with the ministry and the people, in the "rite vocatus." They certainly never found any precedent for this in the New Testament, or in the Apostolic Church. It was a concession pure and simple to the "existing order in the Church," the "historical development," as a result of which they found Church and State united. No one in this country, where we have the free Church, seems to find any difficulty in ignoring the "magistracy," in the call to the ministry, though their recognition is insisted on by all the old theologians. Why then may we not make this further concession to "historical development," and recognize and use, as perfectly legitimate and valid, the method of calling ministers through the synod or ministerium, as a representative body to which the Church as a whole has, by common consent, delegated the right which, primarily, belongs to it? In fact if we hold fast to the most generally accepted theory of ordination among Lutherans, that it is a mere certification of the call, this seems to be the only way by which the right of the ministry to have a part in the "calling" also is fully recognized and protected.†

The only point on which I might differ with Dr. Gotwald is his insistence on the delegation of this right directly and at once to the ministerium. It would seem to be better, more in

*Neostyle Edition of translation by Dr. H. E. Jacobs, pp. 39, 40.

†See remarks of Dr. Seiss at Luth. General Conference, p. 247 of *Proceedings*.

accord with Lutheran teaching and polity, that the synod composed of both ministers and laymen, should do the electing, or "calling," in the name of the whole Church. This would not at all prevent the ministry from conducting the examination and the formal service of ordination in behalf of the synod, as Luther and all the theologians teach that they should do, and as they always have done in the entire history of the Church.

If the objection be still made that this would imply ordination without a call to a local Church, or congregation, against which the theologians pronounce with almost united voice, it may be said that there is good authority and precedent for this also. Dr. George Rietschel, formerly Superintendent and Rector of the Preachers' Seminary at Wittenberg, now Professor of Practical Theology at Leipzig, in a pamphlet on *Luther and Ordination* (Luther und die Ordination) published in 1883 refers to the original records which give a full list of all the candidates for the ministry ordained at Wittenberg from 1537 down to the close of the eighteenth century. From this list it appears that quite a number of those ordained even in the earliest years of the Reformation, from 1537 to 1560, were ordained without having yet received a call to a local congregation. Some of them were simply ordained "unto a future pastorate."* This ought to furnish pretty good authority for at least occasional exceptions to the general rule, or law, and it may be added that such cases are really exceptional even among us, as the great majority of those ordained by our synods, even under our present system, have actually already received calls from local congregations.

When, however, we come to Dr. Gotwald's teaching on ordination we have more difficulty. Here he goes farther even than Loehe, and very nearly coincides with Grabau. He says: "According to some, ordination does not confer power, but only *office* and ecclesiastical authority to exercise the functions of the office, not *δυνάμεις* but *εξουσία*. Personally, however, I can-

*See original pamphlet, p. 25 *et seqq.* Also a review of the same by Dr. A. Spaeth in the *Lutheran Church Review*, Vol. IV., pp. 47-48.

not believe that ordination confers nothing at all, or that ordination is only, and merely, an impressive human ceremony."

After quoting Paul's words to Timothy, 1 Tim. 4:14; 2 Tim. 1:6, and calling special attention to the terms used, he continues: "Such language plainly indicates that ordination is more than a mere impressive ceremony. It clearly teaches that more than mere external authority, or office, is conferred in ordination. It clearly teaches, if it teaches anything, that a subjective, inner spiritual gift or grace of some kind, is, by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, that is in ordination, bestowed. What that gift bestowed is, I do not know; how to define it, I do not know; what exactly is the meaning or degree of it, I do not know. I simply hold middle ground, believing, as Paul teaches concerning Timothy's ordination, that a divine spiritual gift of some kind, and in some measure, is in ordination conferred.

"The question, whether, when a man has been once ordained, *i. e.*, made a minister, he is necessarily always a minister, must be answered in the negative. And in so far as, in ordination, there is the bestowal of any gift or grace, by the Holy Ghost, that also surely may be withdrawn, because of the man's neglect of that gift or grace, just as any gift or grace of the Holy Spirit, when neglected or misused, not only may be lost, but we know is lost." *

The views held and taught to his classes by Dr. Gotwald's successor at Wittenberg, Rev. D. H. Bauslin, D. D., differ considerably from those just presented, and indicate a stronger sympathy with the position held by the Missouri Synod, except for the strong emphasis laid on the inner call, or "movement of the Holy Ghost upon the mind of the individual." He even seems to make this the chief thing in the "rite vocatus," rather than the call from the Church. Dr. Bauslin has kindly furnished me the following statement of his teaching, which I am permitted to quote:

*See Dr. Gotwald's Lecture on the Fourteenth Article of the Augsburg Confession, in the First Series; *Lectures on the Augsburg Confession*, p. 451 *et. seq.*

"I. The ministry, as an office in the Church, is of divine appointment, and is essential to the existence of the visible Church. It is a vocation, an ambassadorship, and not a mere profession. It is a sacred office whose functions are performed in some sense by divine authority. It is not,

"1. A hierarchical order in which ministers are priests to the exclusion of all other believers.

"2. It is not dependent upon any outward and merely hypothetical succession. There are in the ministry no transmitted spiritual functions, no vocational monopoly in the transmission of grace.

"3. The ministry is not identical with the universal priesthood of believers. The recognition of the blessed and scriptural idea of the spiritual priesthood does not confer upon each individual believer the right to exercise the public ministry of teaching and administration. For the sake of good order this right should not be assumed by all, but only by a limited number to whom the rest have, in a way of public recognition, delegated their rights. Not every Christian, in our Lutheran conception, because we emphasize the universal priesthood of believers, should assume the public ministry of the word and sacraments.

"II. The call to the ministry involves certain natural endowments and certain acquired attainments in the cultivation of the endowments. * * * The immediate call to the ministry is no longer given. * * *

"The 'rite vocatus,' or the proper call to the ministry, is to be found in a true movement of the Holy Ghost upon the mind of the individual leading him, through his study of the Word of God, to a clear and heart-felt conviction that it is his duty to seek the holy office of the ministry as the vocation in which he can best labor for the divine glory.

"III. Ordination is not the call to the ministry, and it is not therefore a rite by which men are invested with ministerial authority. It is a ceremony of the Church by which the call is publicly recognized. The Church, no more than the ministry, or the individual believer, possesses any esoteric word by which to appoint ministers and transmit grace. There is no magical

power inherent in its decisions. They avail only when they are in accord with the Holy Scriptures. Accordingly ordination does not confer the essential qualifications and the divine authority of the sacred office, but is the official recognition by the Church of the gifts and graces requisite for the office of the ministry, and the public and solemn induction of the candidate, by a rite of the Church, into such divinely appointed office

"Should the question be asked: Should one be ordained who has not yet received a call to a pastorate? the answer should be, no; because ordination is the declaration and attestation of the call, and accordingly, when no call has been made by the visible Church, by the congregation of believers, ordination ought certainly not be conferred."

Having dwelt so fully on the views held and taught in these two leading seminaries of the General Synod, it does not seem necessary to continue the investigation to the other three seminaries at Hartwick, Selinsgrove and Atchison. Attention may be called, however, to Dr. Zeigler's *Pastor*, and also to the paper on *The Lutheran Estimate of Ordination*, read at the "First General Conference of Lutherans in the United States" held in Philadelphia in 1898, by Dr. J. R. Dimm, one of the professors in the theological department of Susquehanna University at Selinsgrove. The points of special interest in this paper are: 1. The stress laid upon the "internal call" which, he says, "if genuine, is immediately from God." This is a departure from the common Lutheran view which makes even this inner call "mediate," through the Word of God. 2. He makes ordination to be a part of the "rite vocatus," "its consummation and completion," whereas, as has been apparent all through this discussion, the ordinary Lutheran view makes ordination to be simply the ratification and public testification of the call, which is complete without it.*

So far as known to your lecturer, no specially characteristic views are held, or taught, in either the General Council or the United Synod of the South, nor has either of these general bodies ever made any official deliverance on this subject.

*See *Proceedings of Lutheran Conference*, p. 237.

An article by Dr. H. E. Jacobs on *The Lutheran Doctrine of the Ministry*, published in the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY for October, 1874, p. 557, may perhaps be referred to. The headings of the several sections will give a sufficiently clear conception of the views of the author. They are as follows: "1. The ministry is not a hierarchical order. 2. It is not dependent upon any outward succession. 3. It is not identical with the spiritual priesthood. 4. A private Christian, notwithstanding his spiritual priesthood, dare not, without a call to the office, exercise any of the special duties pertaining to the ministry, except in cases of extreme necessity. 5. The immediate call is no longer given. 6. No immediate inner call is known in holy Scripture. 7. Is there then no inner call?" Under this question he says, that our Lutheran dogmaticians "recognize a true movement of the Holy Ghost upon the mind of the individual, in leading him through the study of the outward word of God, to the conclusion that it is his duty to seek the holy office." "8. The call is given through the Church. 9. The Church, in communicating this call, must be constrained thereto and guided therein, solely through the word of God as revealed in the Holy Scriptures. 10. The call communicated by the Church proceeds, (a.) not from the ministry alone; (b.) nor from the people alone; (c.) nor from the magistracy alone; (d.) but from the whole Church, both ministry and people, and where Church and State are united under devout Christian rulers, the magistracy also. 11. That each portion of the Church may discharge aright the duty entrusted to it in the call of ministers, a certain fixed and definite order is desirable. 12. The call has reference to a particular place. 13. Ordination is not the call and, therefore, is not a rite by which men are invested with ministerial authority. It is only a ceremony by which the call is publicly recognized."

Rev. J. A. W. Haas said at the "General Conference," in the discussion over his own and Dr. Dimm's papers. "I cannot accept the theory of Höfling and Walther, nor can I go as far as Kliefoth and Loehle. I would rather, in general side with Philippi. The ministry is given to the Church with the means

of grace. The Church fills it but does not create it. The Augsburg Confession (Article V.) connects the ministry with the Word and sacraments. Christ brought the ministry and gave special foundation work to the apostles, for which he gave them his spirit (John 20 : 22). The apostolate was not continued. It ceased. But the ministry was continued in another form. The apostles and their helpers appointed elders, *i. e.*, ministers, upon the vote of the Church (Acts 14:23; Titus 1:5)"*

The fact that Dr. E. T. Horn's *Evangelical Pastor*, published in 1887, and drawn largely from Dr. C. F. W. Walther's *Pastoral Theology*, was so cordially received and heartily approved in the United Synod of the South, may be taken as indicating the views generally held in that body.

And now, what is the conclusion of the whole matter? Is there any way of reconciling these diverse views, or of formulating a clear and definite Lutheran doctrine of the ministry and of the *rite vocatus*, that can be pronounced authoritative and final and that can be used as a touchstone by which to distinguish the true from the false in all the views presented, or to determine conclusively which view is true and which is false? I trow not. Every one of the authors quoted can, and does, appeal to good Lutheran authority in support of his views, and of nearly every peculiar shade of view presented. So we end where we began, by recognizing the fact that beyond the few general principles fixed by the Augsburg Confession and the other symbolical writings of the Church, we have no definitely fixed Lutheran doctrine on this subject.

Neither is this a matter to be greatly deplored, as it allows room for liberty and for the exercise of that private judgment, both of which are so dear to Lutherans. It is in entire harmony, also, with the spirit of the New Testament, which gives us only a few great, broad landmarks, or general principles, for the organization and government of the Church, but leaves the details to be worked out and regulated by the Church in each age and land, according to its historical development, and the circumstances which may arise. Surely this was much better

*See *Proceedings of General Conference*, etc., page 250.

than that it should have given us a hard and fast system, complete in every detail, which could by no possibility, human or divine, have been adjusted to the needs of all time and of all peoples.

The trouble has always come from the theologians and dogmaticians who have tried to find in the teachings and practice of Christ and his apostles what never was there, and especially with those who, in the exercise of a narrow and sectarian spirit, have been ever ready to denounce and unchurch all who do not agree with them in every detail even of things indifferent, and will allow nothing on which they have reached a conclusion to remain any longer an "open question." If this comparative study of the Lutheran views of the "rite vocatus" shall help to rebuke this spirit of bigotry, and to encourage, as over against it, a spirit of liberty and charity, your lecturer will feel that he has not wrought for nought.

There are, however, a few points of a practical nature, which seem to deserve some attention in connection with this discussion, before closing.

1. *The Question of Licensure.* This system by which a candidate is invested temporarily, before full ordination, with all the functions of the ministry, has no place or standing, historically, in our Lutheran system, and is not recognized by any of our old dogmaticians. It was adopted in the early days of the Church in this country, when ministers were scarce, when we had no regular institutions in which to train candidates for the ministry, and when many unworthy men, taking advantage of the situation, sought to impose themselves on the pastors and churches, and only too often succeeded. It was based, doubtless, on Paul's advice to Timothy to "lay hands suddenly on no man," (1 Tim. 5 : 22), and in that day, and for the purposes sought, was no doubt a wise and useful expedient. But as it is now practised in most of our synods of the General Synod in which theological students are licensed at the end of the second year of their course in the seminary, and are then expected to return to the seminary to complete their course, and to be reg-

ularly ordained at the next meeting of the synod, it is a question whether it is either wise or expedient. In our judgment it has served its day and would now better be dispensed with. We are in hearty sympathy with the remark made by Dr. C. A. Hay on this subject: "To give a license to perform all ministerial acts is to make a man at once, in all essential respects, and in the opinion of the community at large, a fully empowered minister of the gospel, and his subsequent ordination is a mere empty echo of a momentous grant already bestowed."*

2. *Limited Calls.* Another anomaly, from a Lutheran standpoint, which has grown up in the Church in this country, and become quite prevalent in some parts of it, is the limited pastoral call; that is, a call to serve a congregation or pastoral charge for a limited time, usually for one year, sometimes for two or three years. This abuse of the pastoral relation receives little or no notice from the old dogmatists for the reason that the possibility of such a thing could hardly have suggested itself to them with their conception of the ministerial office and call. But many of the more recent theologians, especially in this country, do discuss it, and they all, with one consent, denounce it as unreasonable, unlutheran and unscriptural. If such a system could find any endorsement anywhere it might be supposed that it would be among the Missourians with their extreme congregational view of the Church and ministry, and of the *rite vocatus*. But Dr. Walther says: "A congregation has no right to give such a call, and a preacher is not justified in accepting it. Such a call is not valid before God, nor is it legitimate. * * * The preacher who gives a congregation the authority to call and dismiss him at will, makes himself a hireling, a servant of men. Such a call is not at all the call to the ministry which God has ordained. It is not a call of God through the Church, it is a contract between men; it is no calling but a transient function outside the divine order, an arrangement made by men contrary to God's arrangement, and therefore it is grievous disorder."† The way to cure this evil in our

**Lectures on Pastoral Theology.*

†Quoted in Horn's *Evangelical Pastor*, page 54 et seqq. See also Prof. M. Loy's *The Ministry*, page 179 et seqq.

churches is for all our ministers to refuse ever to accept such a limited call.

3. *The Demitting of the Ministry.* The Romanists teach that ordination confers a *character indelebilis*. Hence their theory is "once a priest always a priest." Even deposition and excommunication cannot destroy the priestly character nor take away the priestly functions of a man once ordained. He is simply a deposed, or excommunicated priest, forbidden by his ecclesiastical superiors to exercise the functions of his office. This view the Lutherans utterly rejected and strenuously opposed. Hence they recognized the fact that a man may be deposed from the ministry for unworthy conduct or false teaching, or may voluntarily lay down his office, and that in such a case he becomes a simple layman, with the same standing in the Church that he had before ordination. And this has been the prevailing theory of our Church in this country.

But what, it may be asked, is then the status of a minister who because of failing health, or because of old age, or for worldly gain, retires from the pastoral office and ceases to hold a pastoral relation to any congregation? In Germany this question seems never to have been raised, probably because such cases seldom if ever occur there. But in this country the prevailing practice has savored largely of the Romish conception, "once a priest always a priest." Such men among us have generally, almost universally it might be said, continued to be recognized as ministers, and to exercise the prerogatives of ministers, other than that of occupying the pastoral relation. In many cases they marry, baptize, bury the dead, and exercise other ministerial functions, sometimes to the great annoyance of settled pastors, and not seldom to the serious injury of the work. They pose before the community as ministers, even when engaged in secular business, sometimes to the scandal of the office because their business methods and transactions are not strictly honorable or honest. Is this right? We think not. But, at the same time it is very difficult to formulate any rules, or to reach any general principle, by which to determine each particular case. Certainly no one would wish those who have

grown old in the work of the ministry, and are no longer able to exercise the pastoral office, nor those who are only temporarily disabled, or are temporarily without charge, to lay down the ministerial office. But it does seem that those who, before old age has come upon them, are permanently retired from the active ministry by reason of any bodily infirmity, and those who, though ordained, have not been called to serve any church and have no prospect of being so called even after years of waiting, and especially all those who have turned aside from the specific work of the ministry to engage in secular business, whether through necessity or from preference, ought to lay down the ministerial office and title, and return really to the ranks of the laity, as they actually have done practically. We believe that this would be more in accordance with the Lutheran conception of the ministerial office and of the call, and that it would also be a practical gain both to the ministry and to the churches. The opportunities to such men to do good would be increased, rather than diminished, by such a course, vexatious interference with the work of regular pastors would be avoided, and the apparent excess of ministers would largely disappear.

4. *Who shall prepare for the Ministry?* If the *rite vocatus*, or regular call to the ministry, now comes mediately through the Church alone, and finds its expression only in an election by some local congregation to become its pastor, or even in the approval of and ordination by some synod or ministerium, how may a man know, before having received such election or ordination, that he is called to the ministry so as to give himself to a suitable course of study in preparation for it? This question seems, at first, to expose a real difficulty and weakness in the Lutheran conception of the *rite vocatus*. But the difficulty largely disappears when we remember that this expression "rite vocatus," or a "regular call," is evidently used of the formal and official call from the Church, or from God through the Church. This, of course, must be given at some definite time and in some specific way. But long before this there may have been a recognition on the part of the Church, in an informal way, of the possession by a boy or young man, of suitable gifts or

graces especially fitting him for the ministry, and also an expression of such judgment in the form of advice, or suggestion, or even of earnest exhortation, none of which should be lightly disregarded. The possibility of an inner conviction of duty, wrought by the Holy Ghost through the Word, is also recognized by our theologians. Indeed such a conviction is necessary before a man can enter upon the work of the ministry, and prosecute it, with any sense of assurance and joy. But sometimes this conviction comes earlier, and sometimes it comes later. Sometimes it precedes the formal call, or even any suggestion from others of a probable fitness for this office. Sometimes it comes after, and is the result of the suggestion or formal call, or of both together. But such conviction is seldom if ever so clear and strong as to be irresistible. In this, as in other things, men may stifle their convictions of duty, and stubbornly refuse to do God's will. Hence the advice sometimes given to young men "not to enter the ministry if they can possibly stay out of it," however well intended, and however much it may savor of a certain kind of pious devotion, does not seem to be either wise or scriptural. It is either mere pious platitude, or it is born of a Calvinistic conception of the divine sovereignty and irresistible grace. It savors also of that spirit of fanaticism which looks, even in these days, for an immediate call from God, and which often, in the belief that it has received such a call, ignores the call from the Church, or sacrilegiously presses forward into the sacred office in spite of the lack of such a call. Rather should we teach and exhort young men to yield to the judgment and obey the advice of their elders and superiors in the Church, and especially of their pastors, and to be ready to give themselves to a course of preparation for this great work even though their own inner convictions of duty may not yet be very clear or strong.

May it not be said, also, that here as elsewhere, certainty can come only as the result of experience. When a young man enters upon a course of study for the legal or the medical profession, or on a course of training for business, he cannot know certainly that he is really called to be a lawyer, or a doctor, or a

business man. And many discover at last that they were not. So a man may think that it is his duty to become a minister, yet future developments may show that he was mistaken. But such a mistake is no discredit to him, if he was honest and conscientious in his course, and if he yields cheerfully to the facts when he discovers his mistake. What is discreditable, is for a man of unworthy character, or of insufficient talents, or of limited training, to try to force himself into the office against the judgment and advice of all his friends and instructors.

And now, finally, allow me to congratulate you, young brethren, on the fact that you are here preparing for this office and work; an office instituted by Christ himself, and a work that well

"might fill an angel' heart,
and filled a Saviour's hands."

I trust that you are all impelled, and sustained, by a conviction that you are in the path of duty, and by a sincere desire to serve God and your fellowmen in the office and work for which you are preparing. If you continue in your course you will doubtless all, in due time, receive the formal and official call from the Church, which is recognized in our polity as the true *rite vocatus*. And, then, as you go forth to the exercise of the office and the actual doing of the work of a minister, may it be "in the fullness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ," (Rom. 15 : 29), not counting your lives dear unto yourselves, so that you may finish your course with joy, and the ministry which you have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God, (Acts, 20 : 24).

ARTICLE II.

HARNACK'S WESEN DES CHRISTENTHUMS.

BY GEORGE U. WENNER, D. D.

In May of last year there was published in Germany a small volume entitled *Das Wesen des Christenthums*, the essence of Christianity. It consists of sixteen lectures delivered by Adolf Harnack before the students of all the faculties of the University of Berlin. The lectures were received with great enthusiasm and their publication is an event in the theological world.

Dr. Harnack is the son of the late Dr. Harnack of the University of Dorpat. He is only fifty years old, although for thirty years he has been a recognized leader in scholarship. After a successful career at Marburg, he was called in 1888, at the age of 37, to Berlin, to the chair once held by Neander. Against the universal opposition of the orthodox sentiment of Germany the call was confirmed, the tradition being that the professor in the university must have absolute freedom.

Among positive theologians his work has generally been received with disfavor. Two of the most important replies are a volume by Prof. Walther and one by Dr. Rupprecht. Others, while rejecting the conclusions of Harnack, regard it as an aid to faith, comparable in some respects with the Monologues of Schleiermacher which were published on the threshold of the Nineteenth century. Schleiermacher was not orthodox, but he was a prophet who prepared the way for Christ. Harnack does not say everything that a sound Lutheran ought to say. But in these lectures he gives a place to Christ and his teachings which must have deeply impressed his hearers. To the intellectual world which had no further use for the Man of Nazareth it must have been a revelation to hear what this leader of liberal thought had to say concerning him.

With majestic mastery of the material, Harnack combines simplicity and clearness of style, so that he is easily understood.

In a few bold strokes he presents in plastic outlines whole periods of history and enables us easily to comprehend the most complicated problems.

Among the foes of Christianity in Berlin, if any came to hear the great liberal pronounce sentence against it or even to subject it to destructive criticism, they were disappointed.

Alluding to John Stuart Mill's remark that humanity could not often enough be reminded that there had once lived a man by the name of Socrates, he declared that it was of far greater importance that men be reminded that Jesus Christ had once lived among us. While in a general way people were aware of this fact, it cannot be said that the character of the instruction which is given in the non-theological departments of the universities is calculated seriously to impress this upon the minds of the students. Some think Christianity is closely related to Buddhism and that its glory consists in a renunciation of the world and in the principles of pessimism. Others regard it as an optimistic religion, a sublimated Judaism. Still others say that it has lost its Judaism and through some mysterious influx of Greek ideas it has become a ripe fruit on the tree of Hellenism. Philosophers declare its secret is metaphysics, and the Ritschlians say it has nothing whatever to do with philosophy. Finally the very latest apostles assure us that it has nothing to do with any of these, except that they are its outward shell. The real secret of Christianity is that it is a social movement and that Christ is the Redeemer of society.

To those who declare that the whole question is of no importance, that a history and a person of nineteen hundred years ago have nothing to do with the present, Harnack shows that what we are and have we owe to history. The gospel is a living power, and whatever confusion may exist in many minds in regard to it, the question as to its essence and value is occupying mens' minds far more than it did thirty years ago.

What is Christianity? This question he proposes to answer purely from the historical standpoint. The simplest answer is: *Jesus Christ and his gospel.* And yet simple as this answer is, it is not enough. For every great man or movement can be

understood only when we ascertain the impression which he makes. Hence we must find the impression which was made on the apostles, and on the first generation of Christians. Nor is this enough. Since it is not merely a doctrine but a life, we must trace it to its product. Not merely its roots must be known but its utmost branches, blossoms and leaves. In this difficult task it is for the historian to separate that which is temporary and accidental from that which is essential and permanent. His method is to consider first the gospel itself, then its impression upon the first generation, and finally its metamorphoses in history.

The sources of Harnack's information in regard to the gospel are chiefly the *Synoptics*—the historicity of these books has been completely restored. John's gospel on the other hand is not an original document—it was composed for a purpose—but as a proof of the impression which Christ's preaching made upon the first generation, it is a document of the highest value. The accounts of the miracles do not invalidate the credibility of the books, because in those days everybody believed in miracles. But Harnack does not need miracles and so they may be excluded. For the same reason the story of the Nativity and of the childhood of Christ may be left out. Strange too, because it is not John, but the Synoptics who tell this part of the story. What then is the gospel, the preaching of Jesus? It may be represented in three concentric circles each of which contains the whole message:

First, the Kingdom of God and its coming. It is not only that which is to come, but it is here already; it is the dominance of the Holy Ghost in the hearts of men. It is super natural, a gift from above and not the product of the natural life.

Secondly, God the Father, and the infinite worth of the human soul.

Finally, the exceeding righteousness, (*περισσέυση δικαιοσύνη*) and the command of love. For the whole gospel may be presented as an ethical message.

Harnack then considers the gospel in its chief relations:

First to the world, or the question of asceticism. Christianity is not asceticism, for the good things of the world belong to God and not to the devil. But three enemies we must destroy: mammon, anxious care and selfishness; and it demands the love which serves and sacrifices.

Secondly to poverty, or the social question. The gospel does not set up a social program, but it compels us to recognize the poor not as servants but as brethren, and our wealth not as a possession but as a trust.

Thirdly to civil law, or the question of secular ordinances.

Fourthly to labor, or the question of civilization.

Fifthly to the Son of God, or the question of Christology.

Lastly to doctrine, or the question of confession.

This completes the first eight lectures in which he gives an account of the gospel and its relations.

The second eight lectures present the history of the Christian religion in its chief features as developed in the Apostolic, Catholic and Protestant ages. That is, the impression which it made on the first generation followed by its metamorphoses in history.

The Apostolic age had three characteristics: 1. The recognition of Christ as the Lord; 2. Religion as an experimental matter; 3. A holy life in expectation of Christ's early advent.

1. Christ was the *Lord*, not simply as a teacher but because of his *sacrifice* and of his *resurrection*. No fact of history is more certain than that these views were not originated by Paul, but that in proclaiming them, Paul simply stood on the foundation of the original church.

Putting aside all speculation as to the need of a sacrifice and particularly as required by the Divine Father, the fact remains that the sacrifice of Christ put an end to all other bloody sacrifices. That there was a need for such sacrifices, the universal practice shows. This need was satisfied in the sacrifice of Christ. "For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified," Heb. 10: 14. Whatever a man's theories in regard to substitution may be, there are few who do not at least acknowledge the inner justice and truth of Isaiah 53;

"Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." The more delicate a man's moral perceptions are, the more certainly he will apply to himself the results of such a sacrifice. No amount of rational reflection will ever be able to erase from the moral ideas of humanity the conviction that unrighteousness and sin demand punishment. Scoffed at and denied, as though it no longer existed, this view continues imperishable in the heart of humanity. These were the thoughts which from the beginning were awakened by the death of Christ and which led to the conclusion that by his sufferings and death something decisive had been accomplished and that what he did, he did *for us*.

But he was proclaimed and believed as the Lord not only because of his sacrifice but because he was the *Risen*, the *Living One*.

On this subject Harnack distinguishes in Ritschlian fashion between the Easter Message and the Easter Faith.

But he concludes: "One thing is certain, that from this grave originated the imperishable faith in a victory over death and an everlasting life. Say nothing about Plato or the Persian religion or the later Jewish writers. They all would have perished and have perished. But the certainty of a resurrection and an everlasting life that sprang from the grave in Joseph's garden has not perished, and the conviction that Jesus lives is to-day the foundation of our hopes of a citizenship in an eternal city which makes earthly life tolerable and worth living.

To the sketch of the Apostolic Age belongs Harnack's picture of St. Paul. Paul was the most distinguished personality in the history of early Christianity. Nevertheless opinions in regard to him differ widely. Up to a few years ago, prominent Protestant theologians could be found who declared that Paul had corrupted the Christian religion with his rabbinical theology. On the other hand, there were those who designated him as the real founder of the Christian religion. But the great majority of those who have studied him testify that he was in truth the one who best understood the Master and continued

his work. This judgment is correct. History shows him as only Christ's missionary, and so we must regard him as that disciple of Jesus, that apostle, who not only labored more, but who also accomplished more than did all the rest.

It was Paul who led the Christian religion forth from the confines of Judaism. This is plain from the following considerations:

1. It was Paul who so construed the gospel that it became the message of an accomplished redemption, of a present salvation. He preached the crucified and risen Christ who has made access for us to God and thus brought peace.
2. It was he who recognized the gospel as something new, by which the religion of law was set aside.
3. He recognized that this new stage was open to all, and he made of Christianity a universal religion.
4. It was he who gave to Christianity a language that could be understood not only by the Greeks but by humanity, and thus brought it into contact with the intellectual resources of universal history.

But while Paul deserves honor for looking beyond the letter, and understanding the spirit of Christ's teaching, none the less do the personal disciples of Christ deserve credit for accepting, after many an inward struggle, the principles of Paul. Peter certainly did, and of the others we know that they at least recognized their validity. It was a great thing to recognize a message that seemed at least in some important respects to vary from the original one, and that signified an overturning of the religion of Israel. Here history showed in a way that could not be misunderstood the difference between the kernel and the shell. Shell was the entire judaistic limitation of Jesus' preaching. Shell was such a word as "I have not been sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." In the power of the spirit of Christ the disciples broke through these limitations. The personal disciples of Christ—not the second or the third generation—stood the test. This is the most important fact of the Apostolic Age.

Without robbing it of its essential characteristics Paul

changed the gospel into a universal religion, and thus laid the foundation of the Church.

A marked change took place about the year 200. The Christian Church became an ecclesiastico-political machine. A distinction was made between priests and laymen. Mediation was essential everywhere, in doctrine, in discipline, in the Book. Living faith was changed into the faith that had to be believed. This period is the *Early Catholic* age. Harnack asks two questions in regard to this age: 1. How did it come to pass? Did the gospel maintain itself in the changed order?

1. *How did it come to pass?* One reason was that the original enthusiasm evaporated and a religion of law and forms took its place. Just as in our day. The first Lutherans were converted and fought for their faith. The later ones were born Lutherans and got their religion more easily. The first Methodists had their anxious bench, the later ones do not believe in excitement. This in spite of Tertullian's dictum *Fiunt Christiani non nascuntur*. Another reason was the infusion of the Greek spirit. The Christian spirit evaporated, the Greek took its place. This is the greatest fact of the second century. It took place in three successive steps, and was continued in later centuries. A. D. 130 it was Greek philosophy which entered the Church. A hundred years later Greek mysteries and Greek civilization came in, and finally, another hundred years later, all Hellenism came and settled down in Christianity. The most important of these steps was the entrance of Greek philosophy, when Christian apologists found the equation, the Logos is Jesus Christ. The unintelligible word Messiah was transmuted into a word which was understood by the intellectual world of that day. It gave a metaphysical significance to a historical fact, and was a tremendous proof of the power of the preaching concerning Jesus. But Harnack claims that it led away from the simplicity of the gospel, and did not lead with certainty to the God whom Jesus Christ proclaimed.

A third reason for the great change in the Church to its Catholic form, was the appearance of acute Hellenism all along the line in the form of Gnosticism. It was a life and death

struggle, but the Church maintained an uncompromising attitude and gained the victory. But it was at a price which has frequently found an analogy in history. The conquered made the laws for the conquerors. In this case the price paid was the establishment of fixed forms in cultus and discipline through which the liberty of the Church was forfeited.

Did the gospel maintain itself in the changed order?

In viewing this period one cannot help admiring the pronounced victory of the Church over all the adverse influences of the times. But on the other hand one misses much. No one may consider himself a child of God unless his experience and knowledge have been submitted to the norm of the Church confession. Nor is it possible for a Christian ever to be quite free from the control of the priest and the liturgy. What is now recognized as the Catholic type of piety, as distinguished from Evangelical or Protestant, began at that time.

Again, Hellenism was conquered, but the Hellenistic idea that religion is primarily a doctrine found its place in Christianity. It was a great thing that the religion of "slaves and old women" should thus master the proudest development of antiquity, should melt down its treasurers and recast them in its own mould. But on the other hand the center of gravity was changed. The question, "What must I do to be saved," which had a simple answer from Christ and the apostles, had now to be expressed in an extensive creed with all paragraphs of equal importance.

Again, the Church had become a great institution and men's hope of salvation was made dependent upon it. The gospel itself was no longer proclaimed as glad tidings but rather as a rigorous law.

Nevertheless, the gospel had not lost its power. It was an age of martyrs such as Perpetua and Felicitas. In the writings of Clement of Alexandria, a Greek in his whole fibre, there is testimony of experimental knowledge of the living God. The Church, in spite of its outward form, was a true brotherhood, and it had a controlling influence on the hearts and lives of its members.

The Greek Catholic Church has undergone no change. What she was in the third century she is in the twentieth. To her credit may be placed the victory over heathenism and polytheism in all the wide borders which she controls. The Greek gods died between the third and the sixth century, not a violent death, but as a result of general debility. Church and religion have become identical with national life. A Greek Christian will suffer himself to be cut in pieces before he will deny his religion. (In the recent massacres three thousand Armenians were slain, though they could have saved themselves by simply raising one finger. They said we are no better than our fathers. We can die but we will not deny Christ).

But when these two facts have been mentioned, all has been said that can be placed to the credit of the Greek Church. This is all she has accomplished.

Characteristics. These are complicated and difficult to determine. In general it may be said it is not a Christian book in Greek binding but rather a Greek book in a Christian binding. In its appearance it is a nature religion, the culmination of the old Greek religion. Its elements are *traditionalism*, they continue in the apostles' doctrine; and secondly, *intellectualism* or Orthodoxy. This is a relic of its old fight with Gnosticism.

Two other elements that characterize the Greek Church are *ritualism* and *monkery*. As to the first, religion consists in the careful attention to a vast number of details in ritual. There is no other way of attaining to the knowledge of God. It is a religion of signs and formulas and idols. As to monkery, that seems to be the one corrective that remains for the evil effects of a distorted ritualism. It stands for experimental religion. If you ask a Russian Christian to-day: "Who is a true Christian?" he will say: "The monk. He does not talk about religion. He practices true Christianity in his life." Has the gospel maintained itself in the Greek Church? Harnack believes that the word of Jesus, even though it is only murmured by the priest, still reaches many a heart. Tolstoi's stories are a picture of life as it is, and they reveal in many a peasant and lowly

priest a simple trust in God, a delicacy of moral perception which unquestionably are a reflex of the Master's life.

Upon the whole the system of the Greek Church is something foreign to the gospel. Piety has been depressed to a lower plane, to the antique standard. But the gospel still exerts its own power over the lives of some individuals who attain to the freedom of the children of God and speak the language which every Christian understands.

The Roman Church is the most comprehensive, most powerful, most complicated, and yet most homogeneous formation which all history has produced. All the powers of the human mind and soul and all the elemental forces over which humanity has command, have aided in constructing this edifice.

What has she accomplished? Two things. First: She has brought up the Romanic-Germanic nations. She gave a Christian civilization to the youthful nations, and not only once for all, as did the Greek Church, but for a thousand years she continued to superintend their training. Down to the 14th century. After that they went their own way in paths which were not indicated by her and on which she was unwilling to go.

Secondly: In Western Europe she has maintained the independence of the Church over against the State.

Characteristics: 1. Catholicism. This requires no illustration. Second: The Latin Spirit. Very early the idea arose in the minds of the Latin fathers that salvation whatever its source or character, could only be communicated in accordance with the provisions of a contract. God showed his mercy in making the conditions, but watches jealously for their fulfillment. The content of revelation is *lex*, the Bible as well as tradition. The legal idea pervades the whole system, the doctrine, the discipline and the organization of the Church. Connected with this is the continuation of the Roman Empire.

For those who have read Bryce's *Holy Roman Empire* it is not necessary to give Harnack's illustrations on this point. The pope is the emperor. Peter and Paul are Romulus and Remus. The bishops and archbishops are the proconsuls, the priests and

the monks are the legions, and the Jesuits are the imperial bodyguard.

3. Augustinianism. This element is the direct opposite of the preceding one, and yet the two have maintained themselves side by side. Augustine's soul had found the living God. He thirsted for him and found peace in him. That which had separated him from God was sin. That which had found him and brought him back to God was grace. To the freedom of St. Paul, "forgetting those things which are behind and reaching forward to those things which are before," he never attained. He was a sinner consoled, this continued to be the complexion of his Christianity. And so emphatically, so powerfully did he express this thought that for fifteen hundred years people continued to experience what he experienced. To this day the living piety of the Catholic Church is substantially Augustinian.

The fact is that when Augustine came the Church had no inner life to offer him. They were compelled to capitulate to him and have never since been able to get rid of him. This accounts for the tremendous paradox of these two characteristics in the same body. They oppose and modify each other, but nevertheless continue to exist side by side.

In regard to the third question, as to the modifications which the gospel has undergone in the Roman Church and as to how much of it survives, Harnack requires only a few words. The Church as such, with its claim of divine authority, has absolutely no connection with the gospel. It is not a question of a distorted gospel, it is a total inversion. Christ says: "My kingdom is not of this world." The pope says it is. Christ leads his disciples out of the religion of politics and ceremonies, and confronts them with God. In the Catholic Church men are bound with chains to an earthly institution and compelled to obey, and when they have done so they may come to God. The days were when Roman Christians shed their blood rather than worship Cæsar. In these days, if they do not altogether worship him, Romanists at least commit their souls entirely into the keeping of an imperial pope.

Protestantism. At first sight what a scanty affair. But it is the most beneficent movement of all Christian history. It means millions of people adherents of a religion that knows no priest, no sacrifice.

As a protest against Catholicism it reveals itself in two aspects: In respect to doctrine it is a Reformation, in respect to the Church or ecclesiasticism it is a Revolution.

As a Reformation in its relation to the doctrines of salvation, it did three things: 1. It restored the gospel to its central place. From the composite mass which used to be called religion, which included the gospel and holy water, the universal priesthood and the pope, the Redeemer and Saint Anna, religion was reduced to its simplest factors when Luther victoriously proclaimed that the Christian religion is found alone in the word of God and in the inward experience which corresponds to this word. 2. It gave a clear definition of the Word of God and experience. Luther's "Word of God" was not Christian doctrine, not even the Bible, but it was that proclamation of the grace of God in Christ which makes guilty and despairing men rejoice in Christ. Experience is the personal assurance of this grace. As Luther understood it, the thought may be stated thus: The confident faith that I have a gracious God. 3. It made a mighty change in the conception of worship. This consists in the Word of God and prayer. Besides these there is no worship.

In emphasizing these three points, Protestantism not only returned to the principles of the early Church, but brought forth to the light ideas which were in the Catholic Church itself, only they were covered up and concealed. Two supplemental remarks may be made here. First: The Church has no other marks than the fellowship of believers in which the Word is rightly preached. Nothing need be said of the sacraments, for according to Luther's view their significance depended solely upon the Word, they are the visible word. Second: Protestantism claims that Christian fellowship rests on the gospel, and that the gospel is contained in the Holy Scriptures. If that is so and there is no external authority, who is to decide on what

is the content of the gospel, and how it may be ascertained from the Scriptures. Unless there is an authority, confusion must ensue as may be seen from the history of Protestantism. This is the answer: The gospel is such a simple matter, Divine and therefore truly human, that it may best be recognized where there is the widest liberty; and that even in the individual souls it will produce substantially the same experiences and convictions. Doubtless many mistakes have been made, but nevertheless a true spiritual fellowship of evangelical Christians has been created and now exists. Amid all their differences there is that in true Christians which is common to them all and which is greater than all that divides them.

In another respect Protestantism was a revolutionary movement. The Church as it was had a legal standing and Luther strictly speaking was a rebel. 1. He demanded that the entire hierarchical church system be set aside. 2. He protested against all external authority in religion. 3. He repudiated the traditional liturgy and ritual. (The Lutheran Church indeed uses the historical service but only on aesthetical and paedagogical grounds and in so far as it may serve to the edification of the Church). 4. He protested against Sacramentarianism. Baptism and the Lord's Supper were retained on the one hand as symbols and on the other hand as acts deriving their value from the word. 5. He denied the existence of a twofold standard of morality, the higher and the lower. He broke the fetters of a false and unscriptural asceticism. He gave the real inspiration to modern life not by secularizing religion but by insisting that religion must permeate all life. In other words there is no distinction between the secular and the spiritual.

It is of course a futile task to attempt to give in a few pages an adequate view of these sixteen brilliant lectures, which are destined to produce a deep impression upon contemporary thought. The general value of that impression I believe will be good. It will introduce many a man to Jesus who will learn more from the Master than he learned from Harnack.

At the same time Harnack's Christianity is not the Christianity of the Church. He knows little of the merits of Christ

and his redemptive work. It is historically beyond doubt, Harnack admits, that Paul did not on his own account place the significance of the death and resurrection of Christ in the foreground, but in proclaiming it he stood upon the platform of the original Church. And Harnack says that no one understood Jesus so well as did Paul. And it is one of the Synoptics who reports that Jesus said that he had come to give his life as a ransom for many. But such difficulties do not trouble Harnack. He says we must overlook them. When a man's historical investigations have enabled him to obtain a comprehensive view of the whole system, such paradoxes may be taken to have some figurative significance which we do not understand.

So too in regard to the Resurrection. We must have the Easter faith without reference to the question of the truth of the message. Again the Synoptics have to be set aside, while Harnack himself admits that the early Church was victorious only because they believed and proclaimed the Resurrection.

And Christ the Son of God. Essential Christianity does not require it. Matthew the Synoptic it is true reports that he said: "All things are delivered unto me of my father, etc.," (11, 27). But that means something else. And when Jesus asked his disciples who the people said that he was, and beatified him who in the name of the rest declared him to be the Christ the Son of the living God, that is a matter on which even synoptic testimony must be modified to suit the requirements of modern science.

In summing up, we may well accept this book as an honest attempt to promote the cause of knowledge and of peace, as Harnack claims in his Preface. But on the other hand we must decline to accept it as the Christianity of Christ and of the apostles, or as that which has been believed in the Church *semper ubique et ab omnibus*.

ARTICLE III.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.

BY REV. HERBERT C. ALLEMAN, A. M.

One may scarcely hope to write anything new concerning the Oxford movement. The literature on the subject is voluminous. Every phase of it seems to have been thoroughly exploited. But it is a subject of abiding interest—because of the actors in the movement, the historic significance of it, the principles involved, the methods employed and the issue of it in present-day tendencies, very active and self-conscious. And it is possible for us to have a better understanding of the elements which entered into that curious anachonism and to lay to heart its lessons for our own problems.

Of the many books and monographs dealing with this interesting chapter of the religious movements of the nineteenth century, "Catholicism, Roman and Anglican" by Principal Fairbairn and "The Secret History of the Oxford Movement" by Walter Walsh have thrown light upon less familiar phases of the movement, which amounts to nothing short of a new illumination of the whole. It is Principal Fairbairn whose keen mind has penetrated beyond the out-works of defence which for so long resisted approach and laid bare with the clearness of a demonstration the fundamental principles of this ecclesiastical revival, while Mr. Walsh, as the result of years of painstaking labor, has collected a wealth of evidence bearing on the several stages of the movement and the results of it, which forms an *expose* which is startling, to say the least. Of the work of the former no endorsement is needed. If any should be needed of the latter, these words of Dr. McLaren of Manchester ought to suffice: "Walsh's book on the Oxford movement is reliable to the full. It has created much irritation among the High Church party here, but I am not aware that any serious attempt to contradict it has come from them. They are bitter about its infer-

ences and 'tone', but they have not ventured to question its facts."

"Dr. Fairbairn's masterly exposure of Newmanism is some consolation for a half century of ecclesiastical imposture." Though his work has been so rapidly retailed during the past several years that its author's name has been separated from it, it is Principal Fairbairn who has showed that in the Oxford movement we have the English expression of the Romanticist tendency which characterized the earlier years of the nineteenth century. "Romanticism was a revolt against the reign of the classical and rational spirit in literature, with its intense individualism, its severe sense of justice and of personal rights." The Romantic movement was German in its origin. It was a name adopted by a number of young German poets—the Schlegels, Tieck, Novalis and others—who loved the realm of the imagination, and hated the rationalism that had expelled miracle from nature, and mystery from man. "The beginning of all poetry," they wrote, "is to suspend the course and the laws of rationally thinking reason, and to transport us again into the lovely vagaries of fancy and the primitive chaos of human nature." And again: "Poetry and religion are one. Man needs an imagination to interpret the universe, and he is happy only as he has a universe peopled by it and for it. These three—poetry, religion and imagination—are one, and are never found singly. When man has most religion he has also most poetry and is fullest of imagination; and the times when he had these three divine graces in the highest degree were the mediaeval." "Admiration for the past," as Principal Fairbairn adds, "though it was a past that was a pure creation of the imagination, easily became belief in the church that claimed it as its own; and so Romanticism in men like Stolberg, Frederick Schlegel and Werner, passed by natural gradation into Catholicism." The transition was easy and logical. "That which enchanted them in the idea of the Middle Ages," says Max Nordau, writing of the founders of this school in literature, "was Catholicism with its belief in miracles and its worship of saints. * * * The obscure symbolism of Catholicism; all the externals of its priestly motives; all its

altar service, so full of mystery; all the magnificence of its vestments, sacerdotal vessels, works of art; the overwhelming effects of the thunder of the organ; the fumes of incense; the flashing monstrosity—all these undoubtedly stir more confused and ambiguous adumbrations of ideas than does austere Protestantism."*

The movement in England was not a simple one. The French Revolution had occurred, and the flush of the new insight and passion arising from that grim awakening, poured itself forth in poetry and romance before the spirit of the times had showed itself in sterner forms. Wordsworth had preached a new message of "admiration, hope and love" through nature as a medium; Scott had evolved from the past visions of chivalry and nobleness, to rebuke, cheer and inspire the present; Coleridge had made the speculative reason and the creative imagination twin sisters ministering to faith.† In politics the new sense of brotherhood had swept across the English Channel and was asserting itself. Liberalism was in the air. Everywhere a more genial spirit possessed men. To understand how inevitable was the influence of the new awakening upon the English Church the relation between Church and State in Britain must be recalled. Parliament is, in theory, the English people assembled for purposes of civil government; the English Church, the same people associated for worship. The supreme legislative authority for both Church and State is one and the same. Ecclesiastical officers are, as to source and sanction, civil; civil authorities appoint men to ecclesiastical offices. The Act of Uniformity was passed and enforced by the civil power, determining the terms of subscription and the persons to subscribe. The theory worked so long as the Church and the State were materially the same; but the Reform Acts emancipated the Catholics and abolished the tests and declared that, for the *State*, dissent, whether Catholic or Protestant, ceased to be; that to a man as a citizen the terms conformist and nonconformist could no longer apply. Dissenters could sit in Parliament and perform ec-

*"Degeneration," p. 73.

†See Fairbairn's "Catholicism."

clesiastical functions. The anomalies of the situation were many and the inexorable logic of it soon became manifest. "The Whigs were in the ascendant, with ample opportunity to gratify their traditional disbelief in church claims and their hereditary love of church lands. * * * The Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Revenues was appointed, the bishops were advised to set their house in order, and almost half of the Irish Sees were suppressed. The outlook was not hopeful, and in the church camp there was rage not unmingled with despair."

This helps us to understand Newman's words: "The Reform agitation was going on around me. The Whigs had come into power; Lord Gray had told the bishops to set their house in order, and some of the prelates had been insulted and threatened in the streets of London. The vital question was: How were we to keep the church from being liberalized? There was such apathy on the subject in some quarters, such imbecile alarm in others; the true principles of churchmanship seemed so radically decayed. * * * With the establishment thus divided and threatened, thus ignorant of its true strength, I compared that fresh vigorous power of which I was reading in the first centuries. * * * I saw that Reformation principles were powerless to rescue her. As to leaving her, the thought never crossed my imagination; still I always kept before me the thought that there was something greater than the Established Church, and that the Church Catholic and Apostolic, set up from the beginning, of which she was but the local presence and organ. She was nothing unless she was this. She must be dealt with strongly or she would be lost. There was need of a second Reformation."*

Newman, more keenly than any of his contemporaries, saw the predicament of the English Church in the midst of the resurgent life of the age. Nothing was to be looked for from the old High Church party. Dry rot had struck its heart. "It was like an ancient dame whose pride is sustained by inveterate prejudices and the recollection of conquests in a time too remote to be pleasantly remembered." Moreover, the High Church

*"Apologia."

party was an anachronism. Its original theory has been built on the divine right of the king. But England had suffered the revolution of 1688 and the Hanoverian succession! The Broad Church party was "inchoate, perplexed, struggling out of its old formal latitudinarian policy into the new spirit, without, however, having found for its idea a form suitable for the century." The Evangelical party, from which more might have been expected because of its sound piety and its true reflection of English sentiment, was helplessly timid. "Its hatred of rationalism turned into fear of reason; it lived within its narrow tidy garden, cut its trees of knowledge into Dutch figures, arranged its flower-beds on geometrical lines, but was careful never to look over the hedge or allow any fresh seeds from the outer world to take root within its borders." The English Church presented an open field for strong and confident leadership. What that was to be, soon developed.

All the great movements of the Church in modern times have been *in principio* university movements. This one was no exception. It takes its name from the great conservative university of England. But Oxford was not conservative in those days. Whately, the great champion of free and honest thought, was leader then. Arnold, of Rugby fame, the great preacher of practical Christianity, the Church reformer and critical student of Scripture, was there; and Hampden, whose sin was his advocacy of the removal of religious tests from university qualifications, and who, to the great consternation of his opponents, in his Bampton Lectures, consistently contended for the supremacy of Scripture over tradition and the independence of spiritual religion to both theological nomenclature and sacramental usage. Oxford was developing critical scholarship. Whately's essays on "Some Peculiarities of the Christian Religion," and "Some Difficulties in the Writings of St. Paul," Hampden's "Philosophical Evidences of Christianity" and The Bampton Lectures and Milman's "Latin Christianity" and "History of the Jews" revealed a spirit which to some threatened to turn the ecclesiastical world upside down.

To one man at Oxford the new Liberalism was nothing short of detestable. John Keble was consistently hostile to the new movement. He saw no good in Liberalism at all. He was an Anglican puritan. He could see nothing good on the other side. "He seems never to have conceived of any religious truth beyond the Church of England. All were false and wrong outside of it. * * * He delighted to see his little nephew under his teaching snapping at all the Round-heads and kissing all the Cavaliers." Mozley tells us that "he induced a number of his neighbors and friends to sign a protest against her majesty choosing a Lutheran prince for one of her sons' godfathers."*

But Keble was not a leader of men. He was happy in the seclusion of his Hurseley home writing the hymns which have immortalized his name. "Keble was a splendid instance of the truth that a man who makes the songs of a people does more than the man who makes their laws." It was Keble who created the sentiment of the Oxford movement. His hymns are "a perfect lyric expression of the Romanticist tendency;" in them "the mood of the moment speaks its devoutest feelings in fittest form." From Wordsworth Keble learned to look upon nature as a sacrament; from Scott he learned to love the past and seek his ideals in it. "His love of God became love of his own church, of what she had been, of what she was, and, above all, of what she ought to be; of her ancient movements, her venerable institutions, her stately ceremonial, her saints and her saints' days." But as Scott's past was the past of the poet's fancy, where noble birth meant noble being and only a knave could lift hand against a head that was crowned, so Keble's "pious meditation fancy-fed" dwelt affectionately in a Church which existed only in the ideal, but he sang of her so sweetly that his ideal became the goal of his contemporaries.

Keble's greatest contribution to the Oxford movement was his influence on Newman. If Keble was its pioneer, Newman was its organizing genius. Newman was an incarnate Romanticist. He says of himself, speaking of his childhood: "My

*Tulloch: "Religious Thought in Britain During the XIX Century."

imagination ran on unknown influences, or magical powers and talismans. * * * I thought life might be a dream, or I an angel, and all this world a deception, my fellow-angels by a playful device concealing themselves from me, and deceiving me with the semblance of a material world. I was very superstitious and for months previous to my conversion (when I was fifteen) used constantly to cross myself on going into the dark."* When he was fifteen, he tells us, he had a deep religious experience. Newman's nature was very impressionable. What strikes us now as we read the story of his life as told by himself is the variety of influences to which he was in turn subject. His spiritual awakening was largely under Calvinistic influences: Romaine, Thomas Scott, Milner's *Church History*, Newton on *The Prophecies*. To the first he confessed himself indebted for the certitude of his "inward conversion;" to the second he almost owed his soul; while by the last "his imagination was stained up to the year 1843" by the teaching that the pope was Anti-Christ. At the age of twenty-one (1822) he came under very different influences. He passed from Trinity College, where he had been graduated, into Oriel as a fellow, and joined the band of liberal thinkers who had been so long at work there. During his first year of residence he says that "though proud of his college he was not at home there." He was "very much alone and used to walk by himself." From 1823 to 1827, he was, according to his brother-in-law, Mr. Mozley, "identified with Whately." "Probably no one who then knew Newman," says Professor Tulloch, "could have told which way he was to go in the end." It was Whately who said that Newman was looking "to be the head of a party himself." It is generally admitted that he had a great love of personal influence. "From the first he attracted by his personality rather than by his intelligence," adds Professor Tulloch, "by the authority rather than by the rationality of his opinions. He never seems to have understood any other kind of influence."

The year Newman broke with Whately was the year Keble's wonderful volume, his *Christian Year*, was published. Illness

*"Apologia."

and bereavement, Newman says, contributed to the change that came over him. Hurrell Froude, whose acquaintance he had made in 1826, doubtless contributed more. In 1828 Froude brought Newman and Keble together. "Keble had previously been rather shy of me," says Newman, "because of the marks which I bore on me of the evangelical and liberal schools." But the conjunction of these two, under the guidance of Froude, laid the springs of the new movement which was soon to take definite shape.

Froude's great influence over Newman is one of our first disappointments in the Tractarian leader. "His opinions arrested and influenced me," says Newman, "even when they did not gain my assent." A glance over Froude's *Remains*, published after his death in 1836, gives us a clue to them. "Really I hate the Reformation and the Reformers more and more. How beautifully the *Edinburgh Review* (1835) has shown up Luther, Melancthon and Co." "Your trumpery principle about Scripture being the sole rule of Faith," etc. He "hated the wretched niggers," because they "concentrated in themselves all the whiggery, dissent, cant, and abomination that had been ranged on their side." What was to be expected from such offensive petulance as this? Newman evidently saw the weak points of his friend. He confesses that Froude had no turn for theology as such, and "no appreciation of the writings of the Fathers, or of the detail and development of doctrine;" and yet he adds: "It is difficult for me to enumerate the present addition to my theological creed which I derived from a friend whom I loved so much. He made me look with admiration toward the Church of Rome, and in the same degree to dislike the Reformation. He fixed in me the idea of devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and led me gradually to believe in the Real Presence." But Dean Church, the apologist of the Oxford movement, has given an adequate explanation of this influence. Keble had "moulded Froude" * * * "but Froude, in accepting Keble's ideas, had resolved to make them *active, public and aggressive*, and he

found in Newnán a colleague whose bold originality responded to his own."*

Newman and Froude went abroad together in 1832, and this visit gave new impulse to what Froude called "the great Conspiracy." Froude's *Remains* throws some light on this visit. While at Rome he and Newman visited Monsignor (subsequently Cardinal) Wiseman. "We got introduced to him to find out whether they (*i. e.*, the Church of Rome) would take us in on any terms to which we could twist our consciences." With reference to this remarkable visit to Rome, the Rev. William Palmer, who for ten years was one of the foremost leaders of the Tractarian movement (but subsequently retired from it because of its Romanizing tendencies, and who was the intimate friend of Newman and Hurrell Froude), tells us that "Froude had with Newman been anxious to ascertain on what terms they could be admitted to Communion by the Roman Church, supposing that some dispensation might be granted which would enable them to communicate with Rome without violation of conscience." Mr. Palmer adds that this visit to Rome was unknown to friends of Newman, and that if he (Mr. Palmer) had known the circumstances it is doubtful "whether he could have coöperated with him." Newman came away from Rome disappointed. When Dr. Wiseman asked him if he would not visit Rome again on his journey, Newman replied in the negative, adding, "I have a work to do in England." It was on the return voyage, he tells us that he "had fierce thoughts against the Liberals. A French vessel was at Algiers; I would not even look at the Tricolour;" and so hateful was revolutionary Paris, with all its beauty, that he "kept indoors the whole time" he was there.

Newman tells us, in his *Apologia*, that he ever considered and kept July 14, 1833, as the anniversary of the Tractarian movement. It was the day Keble preached his Assize Sermon—the very Sunday after Newman's return to Oxford. The sermon was a call to "all true sons to devote themselves to the cause of their Apostolic Mother," promising them that "the

*"The Oxford Movement."

victory will be complete, universal, eternal." In rapid succession followed the Hadleigh meeting and the appearance of the "Tracts for the Times." No one but Newman saw all the significance of the Tractarian movement. Keble wrote of the tracts in a letter, "They are a paper or two drawn up by some friends at Oxford, intended to circulate right notions on Apostolical succession, and also for a defence of the Prayer-book against any sort of profane innovation." But there is reason to believe that Newman saw the opportunity then opened to him. His depressed spirits "yielded to such a rebound" that his "friends at Oxford hardly knew him."

Newman was at last in his element. He was at last at the head of a party. He had taken the "ancient religion of England under his protection and defence." He emphasized the Catholic idea, and the idea grew at his hands. Of the principles he espoused, John Henry Newman was a masterful champion. He set himself, with the assistance of Keble and Pusey (who had now espoused their cause), to vindicate his position with all the power of his subtle mind. Evidently his enthusiasm grew as he neared his desired haven. Speaking of his attitude after 1845, he says: "I have been in perfect peace and contentment. * * * It was like coming into port after a rough sea, and my happiness on that score remains to this day without interruption."* The study of the Fathers was the first recourse of the new league of workers. This was confessedly Newman's idea of what the Church needed. (*Apologia* pp. 144-5). Tulloch says: "Whatever had the note of antiquity was brought to light, and the lineaments of the ancient Church were sought among the debris of mediæval and patristic times rather than in the living pages of the New Testament. * * * The Fathers were taken without question. Neither chronological order nor historical method regulated their selection. A heap of documents of varying authority, or of no authority were cast before the reader. The Ignatian Epistles passed unchallenged. * * * If a writing contained the assertion of what was called Church principles, this was ample guarantee of its ex-

*"Apol." p. 238.

cellence and genuineness." And now these uncritical opponents of the critical spirit of the times show to what lengths men can go who in the name of religion despise reason. In his *Arians of the Fourth Century* (1833) Newman quotes with approval the immoral advice of Clement of Alexandria, in these words: "The Alexandrian Father * * * accurately describes the rules which should guide the Christian in speaking and writing economically. 'Being fully persuaded of the omnipresence of God,' says Clement, 'and ashamed to come short of the truth, he is satisfied with the approval of God, and of his own conscience. Whatever is in his mind is also on his tongue; towards those who are fit recipients, both in speaking and living, he harmonizes his profession with his thoughts. He both thinks and speaks the truth; *except when careful treatment is necessary*, and then as a physician for the good of his patients, *he will lie*, or rather utter a *lie*, as the Sophists say. * * * *He gives himself up for the Church.*" That this became a principle of the movement is clear from Isaac Williams' Tract No. 80, "On Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge," from which we quote: "With respect to the Holy Sacraments, it is in these and by these chiefly, that the Church of all ages has held the Doctrine of the Atonement after a certain manner of *reserve*. * * * The great difference between these two systems (Catholic and Protestant) consists in this, that one holds the doctrine *secretly*, as it were, and in Reserve; the other in a public and popular manner." The same is predicated of Priestly Absolution. The use to which this principle was put will appear from these words of Newman in a letter to the *Oxford Conservative Journal*, speaking of his insincere criticism of the Church of Rome: "If you ask me how an individual could venture, not simply to hold, but to publish such views of a Communion so ancient, so wide-spreading, so fruitful in saints, I answer, that I said to myself, '*I am not speaking my own words*, but I am following almost a *consensus* of the divines of my Church. They have ever used the strongest language against Rome, even the most learned and able of them. When I say what they say I am safe. *Such views, too, are necessary*

for our position. Yet I have reason to fear still, that such language is to be ascribed in no small measure * * * to a hope of approving myself to persons' respect and a wish to repel charges of Romanism." The Rev. William George Ward was Newman's successor as leader of the advanced Tractarians, and this was his view, as given by his son and biographer: "The more straightforward principle is, that occasionally, when duties conflict, another duty may be more imperative than the duty of truthfulness. Make yourself clear that you are justified in deception, and then *lie like a trooper*." Dr. Pusey himself, in expounding the ethics of the Confessional, quotes approvingly the canonical warning: "What I know through Confession, I know less than what I do not know." He quotes from Pope Eugenius, who said that what a confessor knows in this way, he knows "*ut deus*;" what he knows and says elsewhere, he says "*ut homo*;" accordingly he can swear, as a man, that he does not know what, *ut deus*, he knows. Or, in Pusey's own words, "As man he may swear with a clear conscience that he knows not, what he knows only as God." "Is it necessary," Dr. Minton pertinently asks, "for Mr. Walsh, or anyone else, to multiply pages in showing that a movement conceived and controlled by men, ministers of God, whose ideas of truth and honor are such, has had a 'secret history' entirely different from that by which the world knew it, and that it has become a power which threatens not only the integrity but also the very existence of Anglican Protestantism?"

The next thing which suggested itself to Newman was the establishment of a *μόνη* at Littlemore, a part of the parish of St. Mary's, Oxford, of which he was vicar. Newman first moved in this direction in 1838, and it is to be remembered that he did not resign St. Mary's until 1843. (He had been using the Roman Breviary since 1836). The scheme did not succeed at once, mainly because of the wholesome fear on the part of the young men contemplating residence in it that such a step would have an adverse influence upon their candidacy for fellowships in the University. Mozley's letters seem to show that there was a "Coenobitium" early in 1840, though its exis-

tence was very successfully kept a secret. The plan, in its first form did not succeed; but so desirable was such an institution in Newman's mind that in 1842 he removed to Littlemore, where he had secured some nine or ten acres of land for the purpose of erecting a monastic house upon it. Accordingly he proceeded to realize his heart's desire. The Bishop of Oxford interposed an objection, which drew from Newman a characteristic letter in which the principle of "reserve in the communication of knowledge" was again put in practice. He calls the new building a "parsonage-house," said there was "no Monastery in process of erection," no "chapel," no "refectory," no "cloisters." Twenty-two years later Newman wrote in his *Apologetica*: "There is some kind or other of verbal misleading which is not sin." Was this one of the kind? His brother-in-law, the Rev. Thomas Mozley, refers to the building, in his *Reminiscences*, as a Monastic building. Newman's friend Oakeley said the institution was known as the "Littlemore Monastery." Three months before his reply to the Bishop Newman wrote to his friend, Mr. James Hope Scott, in a way that clearly revealed his intentions. "I am," he said, "almost in despair of keeping men together. *The only possible way is a Monastery.*" Whether the Littlemore institution was a monastery or not, the following description of the life there by one of its first inmates, the Rev. Father Lockhart, will aid in determining: "We had now arrived at the year 1842, when we took up residence with Newman at Littlemore. * * * It was a kind of *monastic life* of retirement, prayer and study. * * * We spent our time at Littlemore in study, prayer and fasting. We rose at midnight to recite the Breviary Office. * * * We fasted according to the practice recommended in Holy Scripture, and practiced in the most austere religious orders of Eastern and Western Christendom. We never broke our fast, except on Sundays and the Great Festivals, before 12, and not until 5 in the Advent and Lenten seasons." Another intimate acquaintance is quoted by Mr. Walsh: "During Lent they had nothing to eat each day till 5, and then the solitary meal was of salt-fish. Dr.

Wootten, the Tractarian doctor, told them they must all die in a few years if things went on so. * * * The 'chapel' was hardly more pretentious than the dining-room. At one end stood a large Crucifix, bought at Lima by a Spanish merchant living at Littlemore. It was what was called 'very pronounced.' * * * A table supported the base; and on the table were two candles (always lit at prayer-time by Newman), the light of which was requisite, for Newman had veiled the windows and walls with his favorite red hangings. * * * The days and hours of the Catholic Church were duly kept; and the only alteration made in the office was that the Saints were invoked with a modification of Newman's making—the '*Ora pro nobis*' being changed to '*Oret*.'"

After Tractarianism had become known as Puseyism, and both had developed into what is now known as Ritualism, it was felt by many members of the party that the time had come when the secret workers in what Froude had called "the Conspiracy" (1834) should combine together in secret societies. The first of these was the Society of the Holy Cross, which was founded Feb. 28, 1855, known as the S. S. C. (*Societatis Sanctæ Crucis Statutæ*). It is a strictly secret order, meets with closed doors, keeps hidden the roll of its members, has a complete outfit of rings, vows, retreats and cabalistic countersigns; when two brethren meet, one salutes the other, '*Pax tibi*,' and the reply is '*Per crucem*.' It was this society which published the outrageous book, *Priest in Absolution*, which developed such startling revelations and occasioned such bitter contention. Lord Redesdale, himself a High Churchman of the old type, on June 14, 1877, exposed the whole scheme of the English edition in the House of Lords, and it was afterwards unanimously condemned by the House of Bishops. It was in these proceedings that Archbishop Tait made the statement that there was "a conspiracy within our own body against the doctrine, the discipline and the practice of our Reformed Church." The proceedings of the society in the matter, which are uncovered by Mr. Walsh, form a chapter of indirection and evasion that challenges credence. Though commanded by the Bishops to de-

stroy the remaining copies of the books, the final action of the society, by a vote of 34 to 8, was, "that this synod is not in favor of the destruction of the remaining copies of the *Priest in Absolution* at the present time." It was at the establishment of the oratory of this society in London, that one of its founders, Mr. Shipley said, "they would not be satisfied until they had restored to the Church of England a rendering of the sacred Mass which was fully mediaeval in the richness, costliness, taste and perfection of its details."

The existence of the Order of Corporate Reunion became known only after it had become a large fraternity. Its origin is shrouded in mystery. It is "more unblushingly Popish than the S. S. C., going to the length of acknowledging the Pope as the lawful head of the whole visible Church on earth." It does not, however, advocate individual secession to Rome, but acts on the lines which one of its adherents laid down: "They go (to Rome) to get something which they cannot get, or do not get, or think they cannot get in the English Church. When once they have got this notion in their heads, all the no-Popery tracts and lectures will not keep them back. The real cure is to give them here what they are going to look for. * * * Now, this is what the tractarians, as they are called, are trying to do." The society goes even farther. It professes to supply not only Romish doctrines, but Orders and Sacraments such as even the Church of Rome must admit to be valid, though she refuses to acknowledge those of the Church of England. It has Bishops secretly consecrated, and these are prepared to give conditional reordination to such of the clergy of the Church of England as may choose to submit to the process. It admits the laity of both sexes to its ranks, and these are, as a rule, conditionally re-baptized when they join the order. It protests "against the disuse of Chrism in Confirmation, and the inadequate form of the administration of that Sacrament (?) in use in the Church of England; as well as against the total abolition of the Apostolic practice of anointing the sick with oil." The *Roman Catholic Standard and Ransomer* stated in 1894 (the editor had formerly been a member of the O. C. R.): "We have

heard just lately that there are now 800 clergymen of the Church of England who have been *validly* ordained by Dr. Lee and his co-bishops of the O. C. R. If so, Dr. Lee's dream of providing a body with which the Pope could deal seems likely to be realized."

The early Tractarians, when they commenced their work, taught the doctrines of the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice, but they were very guarded in their statements. This was under the rule of "Reserve in the Communication of Religious Knowledge." Echoes of the doctrines sounded through the Tracts, but it was not until 1862 that a society was founded for the special purpose of teaching the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The name of the society is, The Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament. Its methods are reflected by these words of its Superior General: "We must endeavor to make our position accord with our constitution, in keeping as far as possible out of public notice." Its membership comprises bishops, priests, laymen and women. In 1894 no less than 1682 clergymen of the Church of England, and 13,444 laymen and women, were members of this fraternity.* Its object as stated in the official *Manual*, are:

"1. The honor due to the person of our Lord Jesus Christ in the blessed sacrament of his body and blood.

"2. Mutual and special intercession at the time of and in union with the Eucharistic sacrifice.

"3. To promote the observance of the Catholic and primitive practice of receiving the holy communion fasting."

The confraternity has an extended millinery, combining the styles of the Eastern and the Western churches—not much disturbed because many of its vestments have been declared illegal by the courts of law.

The associates of the confraternity were required, on May 7th, 1897, to pray "that the primitive and Catholic practice of fasting communion by priests and people be generally recognized, and that obstacles to fasting communion be removed." There is a monthly prayer in the ritual of the confraternity that

*Annual Report of the C. B. S., 1894.

the primitive custom of evening communion "may cease." Bishop Wilberforce, though himself a high churchman, made an unsparing exposure of the *animus* of Confraternity. "It is not in a light sense that I say this new doctrine of fasting communion is dangerous. The practice is not advocated because a man comes in a clearer spirit and less disturbed body and mind, able to give himself entirely to prayer and communion with his God, but on a miserable, degraded notion that the consecrated elements will meet with other food in the stomach. * * * *The whole thing is simply disgusting. The patristic quotations by which the custom is supported are misquotations.*"

It would be interesting to follow Mr. Walsh in his exposure of the methods and objects of other secret societies which exist within the Church of England, such as the guild of all souls, ambiguously represented by Mr. Walsh as a purgatorial society; the order of the holy redeemer and the society of Saint Osmond, which seem to be the most esoteric and persistent of the Rome-bound proselyters; the association for the promotion of the unity of Christendom, the common meeting ground for all ritualists until 1864, when the inquisition ordered Roman Catholics to withdraw from it; and last, but by no means least, the English Church union, with its prodigiously active president, Lord Halifax, and its 250,000 members.

The greatest surprise of the many which Mr. Walsh presents is his chapter on sisterhoods. Mr. Walsh makes the statement that "there are at the present time, within the Church of England, a greater number of Sisters of Mercy than were in this country before the suppression of Monasteries and Convents by Henry VIII.;" that these are "purely secret societies; and that they probably possess more wealth than did the Roman Catholic convents in the early part of the sixteenth century. Much light is thrown upon the life in these establishments by those who have been in them; especially Miss Cusack who went from Dr. Pusey's sisterhood into Catholicism, and was known as "The Nun of Kenmare" and who afterwards became a Protestant.

Dr. Pusey's part in the matter of sisterhoods is interesting.

As early as Feb. 21. 1840 Newman wrote: "Pusey is at the present time eager about setting up Sisters of Mercy." He was already in correspondence with Dr. Hook, Vicar of Leeds, about the matter. In a letter dated June 9, Dr. Hook says: "I perfectly agree with you in thinking it to be most important to have a class of persons acting under us, and answering to the Sisters of Charity. * * * What I should like to have done is this: for you to train an elderly matron, * * * and for her to come here and take lodgings with two or three other females. *Let their object be known to none but myself as well-disposed persons willing to assist my curates and myself.*" The year following Dr. Pusey spent two months in Ireland in the special study of Roman Catholic sisterhoods. *The same year*, a young lady, Miss Marian Hughes, who subsequently became the Mother Superior of one of Dr. Pusey's convents at Oxford, took "a vow of celibacy" under the guidance of Dr. Pusey and immediately went to France to "study the religious life of women" there. The rules of Dr. Pusey's institutions, modeled largely upon Miss Hughes' reports, have been kept very successfully from the English public. The "Rule of Holy Obedience to the Mother superior" is one of those disclosed. Among other things is the precept to "banish from mind any question as to the wisdom of the command given you." Dr. Pusey, in his *Manual for Confessors*, required similar blind obedience to be given by Sisters of Mercy to their Father Confessor. A disgusting penalty imposed upon an inmate of one of these institutions was "to lie flat on the floor and with her tongue describe the figure of a cross in dirt." Another rule was that of "Holy Poverty" "the disposition of everything that is hers or may be given to her." Dr. Pusey himself prescribed the use of the "Discipline" for penance. He first became interested in the "Discipline" in 1844. In a letter to Mr. Hope-Scott who was then travelling on the Continent, he says: "There is yet one subject on which I should like to know more; if you fall in with persons who have the guidance of consciences,—what penances they employ for persons whose temptations are almost entirely spiritual, of delicate frames often. * * * I see in

a spiritual writer that even for such, corporal severities are not to be neglected, but so many of them are unsafe. I suspect the discipline to be one of the safest, and with internal humiliation, the best. Could you procure and send me one by B.? What was described to me was of a very sacred character; 5 cords, each with 5 knots, in memory of the 5 wounds of our Lord." About two years after this letter Dr. Pusey seems to have practiced the use of "hair cloth" and "disciplines." On the "feast of St. Simon and St. Jude," 1846, he wrote to Keble, who at about that period became his father confessor: "Will you give me some penitential rules for myself. I hardly know what I can do just now, in a bodily way; nourishment I am ordered; sleep I must take when it comes; cold is bad for me; and I know not whether I am strong enough to *resume* the hair cloth. However I mean to try." Writing later he says: "I am a great coward about inflicting pain on myself, partly, I hope, from a derangement of my nervous system. Hair cloth I know not how to make pain; it is only symbolical, except when worn to an extent which seemed to wear me out. I have it on again, by God's mercy. * * * Praying with my arms in the form of a cross, seemed to distract me. I think I should like to be bid to use the discipline."* Keble would only "per-

*"Some idea," says Mr. Walsh, "of the extent to which these articles of torture are used at present within the Church of England may be gained from the following, which appeared in the *Westminster Gazette* of September, 1896:

"John Kensit, 'the Protestant Bookseller,' has given Paternoster Row a new sensation this week. For some days past a large part of his window has been used for the exhibition of a large sheet displaying half a dozen 'instruments of torture' said to be used and recommended by 'Members of the Church of England.'

"Whoever they are used by—and it is pretty certain they are not mere ornaments or playthings—these 'instruments of torture' by no means belie the name Mr. Kensit has bestowed upon them. Take that broad stomacher of horse-hair, for example, and place it next to the skin; imagine the discomfort of the first five minutes as each bristly hair presses against the body, and picture the torture of each succeeding five minutes it is worn. Then turn from this mild 'Discipline' to the severer penance of the Barbed Heart. This is a maze of wire, the size of the palm of one's hand, upon one side of which barbs project, finer than the ends of the barbed fences of our fields. How many of these are pressing to-day against lacerated

mit," not "enjoin" it. The discipline, however, became the "rule" of the sisterhoods. The purpose of these sisterhoods is perhaps best summed up in Dr. Pusey's own words: "The sister is the pioneer of the priest." To which may be added these words of the late Archbishop Whately from *Cautions for the Times*: "The principle method of decoy, at present, is not so much argument as other kinds of persuasion. Among these, none seem more popular just now than what are called 'Brother-

breasts? Of similar construction, and equally fiendish in purpose, are the Wristlets and Anklets and the broad band of netted barbs which the penitent fastens around his or her leg. All of these may possibly be worn under conditions which will mitigate the severity of the torture; but there would seem to be no way of softening the lash when applied to the bare skin, so what can be said of the two Scourges exhibited by Mr. Kensit? One is of hard knotted ropes, half a dozen ends attached to a pliant handle; the other is of well-hardened and polished steel, each end of the five chains neatly finished with a steel rowel. Every blow from this, when the penitent swings it over his shoulder upon his bare back, must produce five wounds, bruises, or sores. No wonder the crowd gazes incredulously until ordered to 'move on.'

"Since this queer little exhibition opened, the bookseller has stood a running fire of question and expostulation. The instruments had not been on view an hour before a gentleman entered the shop and delivered himself after this fashion:

"'Look here, sir, whoever you are, if you're the proprietor of this place take those things out of your window. It's a lie. It never could be done. I believe it's just one of your advertising dodges. I won't believe that those things were ever made to be used in this day.'

Mr. Kensit is accustomed to that sort of salutation, so he waited till his visitor had ended a long tirade, and then quietly remarked:

"'Will you take the trouble to go into the shop next door and ask the shopman to show you a selection of these things? Ask him (a Roman Catholic publisher) to name his price, and let him tell you who buys them. Then you can come back and apologise to me.'

"'The gentleman,' said Mr. Kensit, when he told a representative the story on Monday, 'went into the shop next door. In five minutes he was back again with a bundle under his arm. 'Mr. Kensit,' he said, 'you're right. They sell them, and I've bought a few to take home and show to my family. They'll never believe it unless I do.'

"'Well,' said Mr. Kensit, 'did you ask who purchases them?'

"'I did,' said the gentleman, 'and if you'll believe me, the shopman said that for every one he sold to a Catholic, he sold three to Church of England people!'

"'I not only believe it,' said Mr. Kensit, 'but I know it.'"—Walsh's "Secret History" pp. 27, 28, popular ed.

hoods' and 'Sisterhoods of Mercy;' the real grand object of which appears to be, not so much almsgiving itself, as, under the pretence of that, imbuing with tractile principles those who receive, and those who administer 'the charity.'"

We have gone thus minutely into these phases of the Oxford movement in order that it may be seen in the light of its fruits and that the present situation in the Church of England might be better understood. With all of these societies and influences at work it is not surprising to learn that there are "upwards of 1200 churches in England where the mediæval vestments are used, where incense and altar lights are employed, and where the ritual is not easily distinguishable from that usually followed in Roman Catholic Churches." It is estimated that no fewer than 3,000 followed Newman into the Church of Rome. The list of distinguished seceders given in Brown's *Annals of the Tractarian Movement* affords ample proof of the services rendered to the Church of Rome by the Oxford movement. But the services rendered to Rome by the movement were by no means confined to the secession of a large number of her best sons and daughters. The Roman Catholic Magazine, the *Rambler*, in 1851, published a series of articles on "the rise, progress and results of Puseyism" in which these companion pictures occur. "From the moment the Oxford tracts commenced, the Catholic Church assumed a position in this country which she had never before attained since the schism of the sixteenth century. With what a depth of indescribable horror of Catholicism the whole mind of England was formerly saturated few can comprehend who have not experienced it. No one read Catholic books; no one entered Catholic churches; no one ever saw Catholic priests; few people even knew that there were Catholic bishops resident in England. See now the change that has come over the English people as a nation. Crowds attend the services in the Catholic churches * * * and a stillness most profound pays strange homage to the elevation of the most holy sacraments." The *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, the official organ of the priesthood in Ireland, in its issue for July,

1891, said: "At this hour five thousand Church of England clergymen are preaching from as many Protestant pulpits the Catholic faith to Catholicising congregations, much more effectively, with less suspicion and more acceptance than we could hope to do. * * * We could desire no better preparation for joining the Catholic Church than the Ritualists' Preparatory School."

And what is the great lesson of the Oxford movement? *If the Church is to have a message for the age, it must have an ear for the voice of the age.* It is sad to think that the Church of England is Romanising; but it is sadder still to think that she lost such a splendid opportunity for a new apology of her faith. The nineteenth century was the great century of inquiry and reconstruction. When John Henry Newman came to his place of power the reconstructive forces were awake and at work in every region of thought and life. Hegel and Schleiermacher were lecturing in Berlin; Strauss in Tübingen was at work on his *Leben Jesu*; Saint Simon in France had just completed his *Nouveau Christianisme* pleading that religion might be more an energy "directing all social forces toward the moral and physical amelioration of the class which is at once the most numerous and the most poor;" Comte had begun to elaborate his positive philosophy. In Scotland Carlyle was preaching his new gospel of work; Combe was groping after a new philosophy of life, and Erskine was wrestling with the old Calvinism. In England John Stuart Mill had thrown off the dogmatic empiricism of his father, had been spiritually awakened by the poetry of Wordsworth and the philosophy of Coleridge, and was looking about for a faith by which to order his life. While Newman was dreaming on the Mediterranean, "refusing to look at the Tricolor" at Algiers, and harboring "bitter thoughts against the Liberals," Darwin was on the *Beagle* exploring the ends of the earth. Everywhere the movement was towards positive ideas and such an interpretation of man, nature and the universe as the awakened intelligence of the new age demanded. It was, says Fairbairn, "a splendid moment for an Apologist, built after the manner of Augustine. * * * He would have seized

the new ideas, translated them into their Christian equivalents; found that every attempt to discover method and progress in creation, whether with Hegel or with Darwin, was no attempt to expel God from nature, but only to make nature more perfectly express him, and be more wholly his. * * * He would have recognized as Christian and claimed for Christianity, the new spirit, with its nobler truths, ideals, aims. What belongs of Right to the Christian religion ought to be incorporated with it; what is so incorporated can never become a weapon in the hands of the enemy." But this was not Newman's attitude. He saw in the new forces only a rebellion against authority, and in the spirit which sympathized with them, treason. He saw nothing of the splendid enthusiasm which was at the heart of the new movement; he faced it as if it were the very demon of revolution. It was necessary, therefore, to discover an authority to bridle and govern it. That authority to be adequate must be visible and supreme. To be supreme it must be religious; to be visible, it must be realized in some venerable and impressive polity or organized society. He did not fall back on the Christianity of Christ—that was too closely allied to the thing he hated; but he tried to recall the lost ideal of an authoritative church. "The ghost of a mediæval church was evoked to exorcise the resurgent spirit of Christ in man."

In the judgment of another—in which we heartily concur—"The controversies in which John Henry Newman figured are about the poorest that the nineteenth century contains; and the various ecclesiasticisms that have descended from them by extraordinary generations would seem to be among the vainest of human interests."* Newman succeeded wonderfully in making Roman Catholics of Englishmen; but he failed wofully in the apologetic which arrests unbelief and baptizes the spirit of a rational age into the faith of Christ. Continuity in dogmatic belief, in ritual, and in institutional form can give the church authority over no reasonable person; continuity of life is the note of the Church Catholic and universal, a life that becomes a

*Dr. Geo. A. Gordon.

larger witness of the Holy Ghost as the centuries pass. New-manism must seem to the normal mind "axiomatic nonsense;" and the syllogism that supports it as credible as would be the claim of the Salvation Army that it dates back to St. Paul, because he exhorted to "fight the good fight of faith" and outlined the equipment of such a warrior. The contention that a given ecclesiastical order is the assurance of the availing type of life rests upon ignorance of history and human credulity. The church that has the soundest intellect, the most devout and loving heart, and the strongest will for righteousness is the best organized expression of Christianity.

NOTE:—Quotations not otherwise designated, except where their origin is plain, may be found in Fairbairn's "Catholicism, Roman and Anglican" and Walsh's "Secret History of the Oxford Movement." Other authorities consulted: Weaver's "Puseyism, A Refutation and Exposure;" Church's "Oxford Movement;" Newman's "*Apologia pro Vita Sua*;" Donaldson's "Five Great Oxford Leaders;" Tulloch's "Religious Thought in Britain During the XIX Century;" Lorimer's "Christianity in the Nineteenth Century;" Froude's "Remains;" Mozley's "Letters;" Harnack's "History of Dogma."

ARTICLE IV.

THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE.*

BY REV. J. M. RUTHRAUFF, D. D.

Mr. President, members of the Board of Directors, Fathers and Brethren :

While I truly appreciate the great honor conferred upon me, I feel at the same time an unaffected sense of modesty in accepting the presidency of Wittenberg College and succeeding in office such eminent leaders as Drs. Keller, Sprecher, Helwig, and Ort ; especially Drs. Sprecher and Ort, who were my personal teachers and whose joint services as President cover a period of forty-three years of the history of the institution. The former is still living, in the ninety-first year of his age, revered and beloved by all his former pupils and friends. The latter is still engaged in the active work of the institution, and his pronounced ability and eminent services throughout so long a time command the admiration of us all ; besides the proportions to which the work has grown, the magnitude of the work which now confronts us, and the vital relation of Christian education to the civilization of the world, cause me to take a most serious view of the responsibility I have assumed ; but relying upon the hearty coöperation of the Board of Directors, the friends of the college, and upon the wisdom and guidance of God, without which we strive in vain, we may at least hope for a reasonable measure of success.

I have chosen as my theme THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE. Inasmuch as Christian education is a fundamental factor in the civilization of the world, and the extension of the Master's kingdom, the Christian College becomes a logical necessity.

I.

In the first place it is necessary to the training of an adequate Christian ministry.

*Inaugural address delivered, June 12th, 1901, when installed President of Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio.

The obligation of the Church to train her own ministry is made very clear in Romans 10 : 13-15 : "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed, and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard, and how shall they hear without a preacher, and how shall they preach except they be sent?"

If, therefore, men are to be saved, and civilization advanced, it must needs be through the agency of an efficient ministry. This ministry must possess an intellectual culture, second to that of no other class of professional men. True, it is written : "Not by might nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord." Yet the Lord does not call drones nor weaklings to the gospel ministry. While it is doubtless true that a man of limited intellectual attainments thoroughly imbued with the Spirit of Christ can be useful, even more useful than the most brilliant scholar who is destitute of the Spirit of God, yet it is equally true that the highest quality of service can only be secured when the highest intellectual culture is combined with the highest spiritual culture. Other things being equal the best educated man will always have the advantage ; hence in an age like this when scientific training is made so prominent, and when the secular world is moving forward with such gigantic strides to still higher scientific attainments, the Church must see to it that her servants are not weaklings in comparison with the men of the world with whom they have continually to do, and whom they should be able to direct in the higher and weightier matters of our religion.

In addition to this intellectual and general culture the minister must be especially trained for the work he is expected to perform. He should know the Book he is expected to teach and the best methods of exegesis. He should be familiar with the history of Christianity and with the religious and philosophical movements that have militated for or against the cause of Christ in the past ; and lastly, he should know thoroughly the history, the doctrines and the usages of his own Church. This is not bigotry. True and enduring enthusiasm is born of know-

ledge. He who knows little or nothing about the history of his own Church, who is indifferent concerning the peculiar doctrines that differentiate his Church from others, who knows little about the institutions of his Church in either the past or present, and who fails to see the great mission that is peculiar to his own denomination, will be of little value to the cause of Christ. He could be at home as easily in one church as in another, but he would lack the faith, and zeal, and enthusiasm, necessary to the most efficient work anywhere. Yea, more, he will be at the mercy of every new heresy or "wind of doctrine" that chances to sweep over the land for the time. The athlete who wishes to jump farthest must start far back of the base in order to accumulate proper momentum. Likewise he who knows best the history of his Church, what battles have been fought, what victories won in the cause of truth, and who has a profound conviction that certain doctrines and usages are essential to the best Christian development, will be the most positive force in the advancement of that cause, and strike the most positive blows and accomplish the most enduring and far-reaching results.

We all admire positive men; "men who have convictions and the courage of their conviction; men who love their Church and know why they love it;" men who are willing to spend and be spent; men who forget self in the accomplishment of the work in hand; men who are ready to "decrease in order that Christ may increase." Such are the characteristics of all great leaders, and men of such qualities are needed to-day in the ministry in ever increasing numbers. Some think we have too many ministers; but not so long as one third of the human race has not even yet heard of Christ, and as only one-third of the race are nominally Christians. Not so long as a large part of the Pagan and civilized world are locked in deadly combat in the field of battle; not so long as nearly one-half the population of our own land is without the pale of the Church; not so long as crime, intemperance, avarice, licentiousness, abound as they do in our own land, and not so long as hundreds of thousands of souls are borne down to shame and death before the gigantic forces of

evil that still assert themselves in our midst. As we do not gather grapes of thistles, nor figs of thorns, so we cannot expect such a ministry to spring up spontaneously from the unregenerate world; nor can we expect such a ministry to come from the purely secular schools supported by the state or by individuals independent of the Church. The Church is securing very few theological students from the State University. Of 1641 students in eleven of the leading theological seminaries, a few years ago, only 61 came from state universities. Of 571 students in the Presbyterian seminaries several years ago, only 23 were from state universities. In six years travel over the territory of Wittenberg and Carthage colleges, I have found but one graduate from a state university in our ministry. If history teaches anything clearly it is that the state university cannot supply an adequate Christian ministry. Such a ministry must be born in the Church, spring from the heart of the Church, nurtured at the altars of the Church, trained and indoctrinated in the schools of the Church, and sent forth from the bosom of the Church to work through her and for her in the advancement of the Master's cause. Hence, the Christian college is a necessity if we would have a ministry. Indeed, if Christianity itself is not to decline.

II.

The Christian college is necessary in order that we may have trained Christian leaders in all other professions and avocations in life.

A test vote in any large body of Christians would show that over three-fourths became Christians before they reach the age of twenty. This shows that character is firmly fixed before this period and that it seldom changes thereafter. Again, the most powerful agencies for the formation of character are the schools of the land. As like begets like, as the child generally bears the characteristics of the present, so the pupils of any school will generally bear the stamp of that school. If the school is deficient in any direction the pupil will likewise be deficient. If the school is lax in discipline the pupil will probably fail to have a true appreciation of law, and the proper reverence

for authority. If the school is indifferent or skeptical on religious matters the pupil will generally become as skeptical and indifferent as the school in which he is trained. On the other hand, if the school is exact and thorough the pupil will generally become exact and thorough in the discharge of his duties. If the school is positively Christian with all Christian teachers, and the curriculum embodying courses in Bible instruction and Christian evidences, the pupil will generally go out from such a school with a positive Christian mould to take his place in society as a leader of a positive Christian type. If, therefore, we are to have intelligent Christian parents, capable of directing the intellectual and religious development of their children, if we are to have Christian merchants and mechanics, Christian teachers and editors, Christian dentists and physicians, Christian law-makers and rulers, and Christian leaders in all departments of life, the Church must educate her own children in her own schools. If this is true, then the Church is under obligations to found Christian colleges in sufficient numbers, and to see that they have the endowment and equipment necessary to do first-class work. While all our colleges cannot become universities, and while no college should add new departments faster than they can be properly equipped and supported, the Church should never be satisfied until some of her institutions become universities in fact as well as in name, until her sons and daughters are furnished with the opportunity of securing, under Christian influences, all the general, special, technical, scientific and professional training needed in any legitimate sphere in life. Unless such provision is made, the Church will compel her sons and daughters to seek their education in the purely secular schools of the land where they at once pass into the atmosphere of religious indifference from which many of them will emerge only to flounder in the deadly whirlpool of materialism, and indifference to all religious duties. Many of these will doubtless become successful in life, from a worldly point of view; but whatever they gain of fame, or power, or wealth, will be largely used against the Church. It will not be used for the building

of Christian schools or churches or for the evangelization of the world. It is the mission of Christianity to "overcome the world," "to subdue the earth." The mammon of unrighteousness must pass under the control of God's children and become the mammon of righteousness.

But, this will never come to pass until the Church trains the leaders in all departments of life who are to make the conquest of the world, develop its resources, gain possession of its treasures and forces, and use them for the elevation of men and for the glory of God. It is the province of Christianity to discover to the world true ethical standards; to create pure, moral sentiment; to secure the enactment of righteous laws, and to exalt to all positions of trust and influence incorruptible men, who will enforce law and be "living epistles seen and read of all men."

The Church is making some progress in this direction and is producing many noble men and women who are making themselves felt in all departments of life; but the standards are yet too low, and public sentiment too weak, and the number of true men too limited. As long as a large per cent of the men who control the vast commercial enterprises, make our laws, and rule our land, are born in godless homes, educated in purely secular and godless schools; actuated by purely worldly ambitions; and secure their special training from the heartless world, progress must necessarily be slow and Christianity often seem weak and a failure. The remedy is the Christian College. A college doing university work in fact as well as in name. A college so ably equipped with buildings and apparatus, and so liberally endowed, that the ablest teachers can be secured. And a college so many-sided that when we invite young people to come to the institution they can feel that they are securing all that they need in quality and extent of work done, equal to that of the best institutions of the land. When such provision is made for our own children, and when Christians are consistent enough to their own children to send them to their own institutions, then we shall soon see an army of men and women springing up as by magic as superior to the mere worldling as Daniel and his

companions were superior to the wise men of the East, who shall transform the homes of the world into Christian homes, who shall by their irresistible power and superior merit gain control of the vast business concerns, legislative halls, the executive office, and of the public schools and universities. Not that the State and the Church will be organically united, but that Christian sentiment will be so pronounced that no unbelieving teacher or ruler can ever be elected to any position where the rising generation may be mistaught, or where legislation might be corrupted, and justice miscarried. You may say that this is too idealistic; granted that it may seem so; yet if we do not in some true sense apprehend the ideal we will never be able to become truly conscious of the weakness of that which is real. A straight edge is necessary to detect the irregularities of a piece of timber. A view of the spotless character of Christ is necessary to reveal to us our own imperfections. Some may say that it is impossible of attainment; granted that it may not be fully realized in our day; yet if we do not see the ideal we will not desire anything better than we have; and if we do not desire the ideal we will make no effort to improve upon that which now really exists; and indifference on any subject is demoralizing and retrograding. Indeed, if we do not begin to strive for that which is better no progress will be made. "To him that hath shall be given, and from him that hath not shall be taken even that which he hath." We sincerely believe that the Christian College, even in this comprehensive sense not only may be, but will be realized in the near future. Our civilization is preeminently the fruit of Christian education. All the schools and colleges of this land were Christian schools for many generations, and over nine-tenths of the colleges in our land to-day are Christian colleges. The purely secular school or state university is, comparatively, of recent origin. The agencies that have done so much to produce our civilization must continue to operate, not only to preserve what we have, but to carry it to a higher degree of perfection. In order to do this, however, the Christian College must fully meet the demands of the age. It must compete with the purely secular

school or state university both in the scope and quality of its work. No backward step dare be taken. The watchword must be Forward. If ground has been lost in any degree in the past by our indifference, or by our failure to fully apprehend our duty toward the business world, and to make proper provision for training its leaders, this ground must be redeemed. If the Church has been neglectful of this great cause she must be aroused from her lethargy. Indeed, the Church is already awaking to a fuller consciousness of the great need in this direction. The subject is being investigated as never before. More sermons are preached, more books, papers and magazine articles are published annually on this subject than ever before. The information is going abroad. Men are thinking, reading and acting. As a consequence more large gifts and legacies have been given to Christian institutions in the past ten years than in generations before. Many of our weak colleges have been made comparatively strong and their future guaranteed. Memorial buildings are being erected, chairs are being endowed, scholarships and fellowships are being founded. This work has but to be carried on under wise direction and the desired end will be attained. The college lays claims upon the Church for patronage and support. It furnishes a ministry for the Church, it furnishes opportunities for her children to prepare for their life work, and it contributes to the general culture of the land. The college also lays just claims for support upon the community in which it exists. It puts thousands of dollars annually into circulation. It affords an opportunity for education to the young people of that community that they could not otherwise have, and it elevates the moral and intellectual tone of the entire community. The blessings of the Christian College are beyond estimate; when these facts are properly understood friends will rise up at home and abroad who will bring to it the support needed.

III.

The college should be under denominational control, and stand for some definite statement of religious truth. Not that the college is to teach the distinctive denominational tenets to the

regular undergraduate classes. This is unnecessary, and would be an innovational that is seldom if ever practiced by any denominational college. The place to teach the distinctive denomination tenets is in the theological seminary, or in voluntary classes organized for that purpose. Yet, denominational control is necessary that nothing contrary to the belief of the denomination shall be taught. It is necessary as a safeguard against the teachings and influence of indifferent and skeptical teachers who frequently find their way into the faculties of secular and undenominational colleges. Denominational control is necessary that a positive religious sentiment may surround the entire student body, that will strengthen the religious character of believers, and if possible lead the indifferent and unbelieving student to accept Christ. This end will be accomplished by the courses offered in Bible study, by the study of ethics and theism, by the daily chapel exercises, by the work of the different Christian associations, and such special services as may be found profitable from time to time, and by the Christian character and example of the teachers and student body. Denominational control is necessary in order to guarantee the permanent religious character of the institution; and to guarantee that the funds contributed for the founding and development of the school shall be used permanently for the advancement of the cause of Christian education substantially in the sense in which the donors intended they should be used; and that at some future time the agency they have created may not be used for a directly opposite purpose. There can be no certainty that an undenominational school will remain safely Christian even if all the teachers and trustees are pronounced Christians to-day; for they are pledged to no particular religious belief and each member of the Faculty and of the Board is at liberty to adopt any confessional basis he may choose and to change or modify his views whenever he may choose. He may believe in the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, the doctrine of regeneration and in the supernatural element in the Scriptures to-day; while he or his successors in office may come to believe the opposite tomorrow. An absolute monarch may be just and humane to-

day. He or his successors might become Neros to-morrow. Only a constitutional government, where the rulers are bound to certain constitutional requirements and where the rulers are chosen by the people themselves can give the assurance of certainty and permanency to the government of any people. So only when the college is controlled by some denomination that has a specific, confessional basis, to which the teachers and Board of Directors are pledged, can there be a certainty that the institution will not be diverted from its original purpose. Individuals may change their views. They have a right to do so whenever they choose, but when they do choose to change to such an extent that they are no longer in harmony with the obligations they have assumed, when they entered upon the position they hold, there is but one honorable course to pursue, viz: to vacate the position. Where this is not done voluntarily the Board of Directors should see that it is done, and that men are elected who will faithfully carry out the will of the Church they represent. To make certain of this, the Board of Directors should never be a close corporation, perpetuating its own existence; but its members should always be elected by the synods or religious body whose ends it is founded to serve. Individual members of a Board, or their successors, sometimes change their views most radically, and have diverted institutions, not infrequently, from their original purpose, contrary to the convictions of the great body it was founded to represent. Such a possibility should never exist. Religious denominations do sometimes modify their views and when they do their institutions legitimately go with them; but Christianity is properly conservative. The Church believes that the great body of doctrine she holds is of divine origin and as immutable as the character of God. Whenever a misapprehension or inaccurate statement of this truth is discovered and has passed into the consciousness of the great body of believers that constitute the Church, a modification of statement or interpretation thereof may be necessary; but such changes are rarely necessary and should be made with the greatest of care. Therefore, all the institutions of the Church should be so absolutely under her

own control that their character cannot be changed until the Church, as a body, sees fit to modify her position. This is necessary in order to secure permanency in the character of the institution and to command the confidence, coöperation, patronage and support of the membership of the Church at large. Again, denominational control is necessary to the spread of religious truth. He who does not believe anything definitely will put forth little or no effort to disseminate his views. Only that man or class of men who believe that they have apprehended the truth most clearly, and that those truths are of vital importance to the welfare of men will become zealous in the propagation of their views. Denominationalism has the advantage of being rooted far back in the history of civilization, of having in it a force that has accumulated along with the development of Christian doctrine and the advancement of civilization. It is necessarily conservative. It will be slow to change its convictions or to surrender its position. It believes something definite concerning the Holy Scriptures and it believes it most profoundly; but this conservative position, this rigid grasp upon historical Christianity, has in it a force of great value. Because of this force, this accumulation of historic power, this incarnation of Divine Truth, the Church becomes permanently and persistently aggressive in the spread of the gospel. Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day and forever, and his Church must be as secure and immovable as the truth of Christ which it embodies. It holds truth that does not fade with the advance of civilization, but only reveals itself more clearly in human consciousness and human living. It is this development of Christianity alone that has been able in the past to withstand the different forms of heresy with which the Church has been assailed; and it is only this conservative form of Christianity through the agency of our own institutions of learning that will be able to withstand and overcome the rationalism, stoicism, and materialism of the present time. These forces assail the very citadel of Christianity. They endeavor to rob humanity of its belief in the supernatural element in the Holy Scriptures, of the efficacy in prayer and personality of God.

IV.

Wittenberg College is owned and controlled by the Evangelical Lutheran Church. All the members of her Board of Directors, except four, are elected by the five following Synods: The East Ohio, Wittenberg, Miami, Olive Branch, and Northern Indiana. Each synod elects one clerical and one lay director for every ten ministers on her Synodical roll. But no Synod is entitled to more than eight directors. Two of the remaining directors are nominated by the Alumni association, subject to the approval of the Board of Directors. The remaining two are elected by the Board of Directors to represent Clark County. The Board is now composed of forty members, one-half of which retire or are re-elected every two years. The object of the institution as stated in the Charter is: "The promotion of theological and scientific knowledge." The object as stated in the constitution is substantially the same, viz: "The promotion of Christian Education," a chief aim being "the education of young men for the ministry of the Evangelical Lutheran Church."

Each member of the Board of Directors is required on taking his seat to "make and subscribe to the following declaration: "Do you sincerely approve of the object of Wittenberg College and do you solemnly promise to endeavor faithfully to carry into effect the provisions of its charter and constitution and thus promote the great design of the institution?" The constitution provides that: "No person shall be elected to a professorship in the Theological Seminary who has not been a pastor of an Evangelical Lutheran Church for at least five years." Upon taking his seat, and every fifth year thereafter, each professor in the Theological Seminary is required to subscribe to the following declaration: "I do solemnly declare in the presence of God and this Board that I do sincerely believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the inspired Word of God, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice; and I believe that the Augsburg Confession is a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Divine Word and of the faith of our Church founded upon that word; and I promise to teach and vindicate these doctrines and principles in opposition to the

views of Atheists, Deists, Socinians, Unitarians, Arians, Universalists, Antinomians, Pelagians, Anabaptists, Papists, and all other errorists, so long as I remain a professor in this institution." Concerning the professors in the other departments of the college the Constitution says: "No person shall be elected professor in this institution who is not a man of approved piety, and a communicant in some branch of the Evangelical Church." Every professor before entering on the discharge of his duties is required to make the following declaration: "I solemnly promise to discharge faithfully all the duties of my professorship and to conform to all the regulations of the institution, and requirements of this constitution."

So far, therefore, as the object and management of Wittenberg College is concerned, it is not only positively Christian, but under safe denominational control; and can never be swerved from its original purpose so long as the Church to which it belongs does not change her confessional basis. While special emphasis is laid upon the work of training young men for the ministry, and properly so, the way was opened and the foundation laid at the very beginning for scientific training. The work of the institution can be lawfully expanded to meet all scientific and professional training needed by society in any direction, and for all times. The quality of the work done has always been of a high order; many of her Alumni have attained high professional rank, and will compare favorably with those of the best institutions in land.

The College is no longer an experiment. It has lived long enough to demonstrate its power both to endure and to be useful. With the growth of the institution, the growth of the Church and the advance of civilization, there has also come increased demands. The College needs additional endowment and additional buildings and equipments to support easily the work already undertaken, and to add other lines of work needed in this age. I am satisfied that if we had means enough to support a few additional professors, and to erect a science hall, properly equipped, scores of young people could be at-

tracted to Wittenberg to secure scientific and professional training who are now compelled to go elsewhere; many to purely secular schools.

We need a Y. M. C. A. building, with gymnasium equipment. We need a building for the conservatory of music, with recitation rooms and equipment, and a large auditorium in which the recitals, lectures and commencement exercises may be held.

We need an art building, where an art museum could be accumulated, with properly equipped studios. And in time medical, law and other departments should come. Indeed I hardly know which should come first.

I am certain that such an extension of the work of the institution would prove of great value to the city, to the Church and to the land. For as I have already said, the Church must provide for the training of all the leaders of society, in all business and professional lines. The demand is upon us, and the command to go forward is most imperative.

Will we heed the command? Will we meet the demand?

Would that God would lead some of his children, to whom he has given the power to create wealth, to a larger realization, both of their responsibility, and glorious privilege, to serve their age and honor their Maker by giving to this noble institution, the means needed for its proper enlargement and equipment.

Let us earnestly hope and fervently pray that this may be speedily and amply done.

ARTICLE V.

THE CHANGED CONDITIONS OF EDUCATION.

BY C. S. ALBERT, D. D.

"The nineteenth century," says Alfred Russell Wallace, "marks the beginning of a new era of human progress." And surely to the observant this claim is substantiated when its achievements are considered. Its discoveries have changed the outward conditions of life. Its larger knowledge has destroyed the very conceptions of the world and its growth which our fathers held. The directive principle of its thought, evolution, is masterful and antagonistic to much that the men of other centuries considered axioms. It is a new world in which we live, and this world has largely come into being during the last fifty years.

A few considerations, briefly stated, will more clearly indicate this.

President Taylor, of Vassar College, in *A New World and an Old Gospel*, has pointed out that these years have added immensely to the knowledge of the universe. "It was in 1845 that Neptune was discovered, extending enormously the limits of the known universe, and most of the measurements of the stellar spaces have taken place since then. Over 400 small planets have been discovered since 1850, and as late as 1892 the fifth satellite of Jupiter was brought within reach of the telescope. The vast spaces of the solar system are found to be filled with solid bodies, streams of which, as meteors, pass through our orbit, and before them the old nebular hypothesis seems to be giving way to a theory of the stellar universe formed of solid particles, united by impact and heat."

The world has been changed historically and temporally. The world-period of six thousand years since man's creation is no longer tenable. Archaeology in Babylon and Egypt has revealed that historically man was there perhaps from 5,000 to

10,000 years B. C., and that back of this was an age not historical.

Geology, by its discoveries of the immense periods of time, has changed our vision of the past. But what is more important to thought, it has shown that the same forces which built up the earth are still at work. The unity of the power to create and to preserve is one. This is another world and requires different thinking from the old world of our fathers.

Again, invention has almost annihilated distances in the world. Steam and electricity have nearly banished space. Friend speaks with friend a thousand miles away. The Transvaal and the Philippines are nearer to us than Europe was to our fathers. What is of more consequence, these conditions have affected all our social, industrial, economic, political and spiritual life. They bind nations together as nothing ever did before. They lessen world-spaces and make its distant points near. Interests hitherto diverse, and isolated, now intertwine and have common relations.

Inventions have changed the world industrially, until we are confronted by the most serious problems of labor and capital, gigantic in their combinations and involving the well-being of millions. Industrial questions are new and strange.

Politically and socially vast changes have occurred. The people have come into power, slavery has disappeared. The ancient East is no longer sealed; the nations are in contact as never before; vast aggregations of people in cities bring distressing social conditions. Problems, our ancestors had, but never handled, vaster and profounder, are studied. Political economy and social problems must be considered and weighed.

Again, we are confronted by the discoveries of biology. Biology is the science of the phenomena of life. It has traced all life back to protoplasm, "the cell," beginning with this the biologist traces the structure, physiology and growth of the human nervous system. He deals with facts. And so psychology has come to be studied on the basis of physiology. Sociology must consider it in its investigations. Ethics, morality as a science,

is profoundly affected by its discoveries. Yet, biology was born as a science in 1860.

A new theory, at least in its scientific aspect, has come to stay in these last fifty years, the theory of evolution, which is dominant in many departments of knowledge, and affects all. It has brought modifications and changes. We may not concede the claims of its advanced advocates, but we cannot hide from ourselves that it has affected our views of creation, of history, religion, the Bible, and the Church.

It follows from these data that the scope of education has been vastly enlarged. Objects of study, departments of knowledge, of which our fathers either knew nothing or but vaguely, are now embraced in the curriculum of the educators. They have seriously affected educational methods and schemes which heretofore have laid down the preliminaries for the professional man. The classical course, so long unchallenged and dominant, is sharply criticized. Assault has been made on the study of Greek in particular and the classical languages in general as educational values and forces. Germany, the home of the idealist and dreamer, has felt the modern movement and the trend to the practical, and is being induced to rearrange its estimate of fundamental educational values.

The conditions of education have been changed both by the vastness of modern knowledge and the clamant demand of this practical age with its industrial victories and problems. There is a marked tendency to specialization which seeks to begin in the preparatory stages of education even in those of our common schools, and to grow more intense as it ascends to the higher stages of the college and university.

Under such conditions there must be an insistence on the true meaning of education. It must be allowed that the earlier schemes of higher education were largely in the interest of the clergy and of the men of literary leisure. The insistence put upon the classics was in their behalf, preparing them for their profession and a liberal education.

Underneath it all, however, there was a grasp of the fundamental meaning of education. The object of the collegiate ed-

ucation was the making of a man, by the development of his intellectual powers, and the formation of a moral and righteous character. There was therefore a broad and comprehensive training in disciplinary studies, in the classics, mathematics, history, moral and mental philosophy and the principles of science. The outcome was a balanced mind, master of its powers, taught to reason and judge, possessed of general information. "The college teaching was inadequate in quantity to enable a student to pretend to the mastery in any department, but adequate both in quantity and quality to enable even the less able students to estimate justly the world in which they lived and their capacity for usefulness in it." Above all the college of fifty years ago in our land had a high sense of its responsibility to so influence men morally and religiously that they should go forth from its walls men capable of justly estimating the value of work done by others in widely different spheres, men aware of their obligations to society, to their land and to their God, men of tough moral fibre, with high ideals of a noble life, determined to be of service to their fellow-men. Educated men were then looked up to as the champions and defenders of truth and right.

How deeply ingrained was this conception, the words of Prof. Huxley on a liberal education beautifully express, though, because he did not lay hold firmly on God, he fails to recognize the part which God should have in the educated life:

"That man, I think, has had a liberal education, who has been so trained in his youth that his body is the ready servant of his will, and does with ease and pleasure, all the work that as a mechanism it is capable of; whose intellect is a clear, cold, logical engine, with all its parts of equal strength and in smooth working order; ready, like a steam engine, to be turned to any kind of work, and spin the gossamers as well as forge the anchors of the mind; whose mind is stored with a knowledge of the great and fundamental truths of nature and of the laws of her operations; one who, no stunted ascetic, is full of life and fire, but whose passions are trained to come to heel by a vigorous will, the servant of a tender conscience; who has learned

to love all beauty, whether of nature or of art, to hate all villainess, and to respect others as himself.

"Such a one and no other, I conceive, has had a liberal education, for he is, as completely as a man can be, in harmony with nature. He will make the best of her, and she of him. They will get on together easily; she as the ever beneficent mother, he as her mouthpiece, her conscious self, her minister and interpreter."

After the college had laid the foundations of intelligent and moral manhood, the student was regarded as prepared for special work, for university work. He would ever carry with him into the particular province of knowledge he had selected as his own the conception of the largeness of the vast domains of knowledge in general. It curbed conceit. It balanced his judgments. He did humbly his particular work, readily acknowledging that there were other fields, as important as his own, concerning which he was not authority.

Special work from the beginning, the work which ignores the broader liberal education, has the tendency to narrow men, to warp their judgment, to make them incapable of putting a correct value on other departments of knowledge. This is most true of those who delve in the material. They lose their sensitiveness of mind and spirit to the spiritual. The eye of the soul films, its ear grows dull just as the great English scholar Darwin, devoted to science alone, died at last to the sweetness of music, to the thrill of poetry. No voice of singer could charm, no verse of Shakspeare stir response in him. His finer perceptions were atrophied from lack of use.

The college, the American college, therefore stands for foundations, the university, for special work. Broadly stated, the function of the college is the development of manhood, of the university, the enlargement of the boundaries of knowledge.

But another changed condition is apparent. The university has made the college curriculum a part of its course, and claims that it can lay better foundations than the smaller college. We may be sure that this claim is not made recklessly. Its advocates produce strong arguments in justification. The univer-

sity being richly endowed can enlarge its curriculum. It can call into its service a body of teachers and professors, each one of whom is a master of his department, competent to instruct; it claims that it is impossible that one man should successfully teach several departments, as the small college limited in endowment, makes obligatory on its professors. It commands the services of young men full of the enthusiasm of youth and in touch with the most modern methods, whilst at the same time it retains the services of the older men, ripe in learning and experience. The aggressiveness and dash of youth, so potent to kindle a like spirit in young men, is happily wedded to the caution and wisdom of riper years.

The small college has its distinct advantages, however, provided it is well-equipped for its particular function, and possesses men of learning, who are true teachers, able to impart knowledge and stimulate students. In the small college the student comes into direct contact with his professors. The professor and the student meet together and know each other. The young man regards the older as a friend, counsels with him about his studies and his future. The professor becomes interested in the man and the development of his character. He has time and opportunity to know his student. In the university much of this is lost. The unformed tutor is too often the instructor of the student. The professor and the boy do not come into constant and intimate personal contact.

There is, too, a distinct advantage to the student of the smaller college in the field it gives him for the development of individuality and personal power. One has well said: "As numbers diminish, individual responsibility increases. Few things are of more importance for an American boy than that he should early come to feel a degree of personal responsibility for the organic and social life about him. It is a great injury to a boy and to public interests that he should grow up content to be 'one of the mass,' to have his thinking done for him, and to take no part and feel no obligation in relation to what affects the common welfare. In the small college the individual counts for the utmost. His influence is at its maximum. Others find

him out, he finds himself out and he finds his own place. In the organizations of the college he finds the freest scope for whatever talent he has for leadership, counsel or helpful co-operation. The college is thus a gymnasium for the development of individual manhood."

Perhaps here is the reason why so large a proportion of the masterful men in literature, statesmanship and religion have been the sons of the small college. But we come now to a graver consideration, namely, the consideration of moral and religious influence. The undergraduate days are those in which a young man is most sensitive to influence in manners and morals, faith and character. Dr. Patton says: "A father may well feel that his son's refined demeanor would be a poor offset to his loss of religious faith, and that great attainments would not atone for bad habits. A young man would do well to consider the moral as well as the intellectual influences that surround a college or university. His undergraduate life will certainly not be a conspicuous success if he fails to acquire as the result of it that discipline of his powers and that degree of knowledge necessary for independent inquiry. But it will certainly be a conspicuous failure if he does not learn to scorn everything that is base and mean; if he does not come into possession of high ideals of conduct, and above all, if he ceases to maintain a reverent attitude toward the spiritual side of life.

"The first thing to be considered in regard to an institution of learning, whatever be its size and wheresoever it be situated, is, what is the moral tone of the place and what efforts are made there to keep the students under the best influences?"

The instinct of the Church has been correct when it provided the denominational college with professors, decided in Christian life and doctrine. It was the instinct of self-preservation, but also the perception that its peculiar life could only exert its strongest influence where the conditions were favorable to that life. It had regard for the young man as well as for itself.

Such colleges have in the past wonderfully won men to Christ. There the religious life has become precious to many.

These colleges through their instructors strong in intellect and devoted to God, have often been the means of salvation to thoughtless young men. It is remarkable that with a few noble exceptions our educated Lutheran laymen who are of untold value to the Church were educated in our Lutheran denominational colleges.

There is a distinction from the beginning between colleges. Some are founded from convictions, convictions of their absolute need as educational and moral factors. All over this land there are found colleges built to exploit a town and add to its attractions. But others have been founded on conviction, have been begun in sacrifice and continued in sacrifice. Carthage and Midland as well as Hartwick, Gettysburg, Wittenberg and Susquehanna, stand for conviction and sacrifice by self-denial and high ideals. The moral atmosphere thus engendered remains to invigorate the pulses of the spiritual life.

The state universities are the outcome of our educational system. We do not condemn them, but they are not distinctively Christian, either in the selection of professors, or in their influence. They cannot be, when the demand is that there shall be no distinctive religious teaching, when many who occupy chairs are either indifferent to or openly antagonistic to Christianity. Religious influences there are, but they are not dominant.

The same conditions prevail in others of the universities not supported by the state. The moral and religious influences are not dominant. How true this statement is, the following, quoted by Dr. Ray before the Presbyterian General Assembly, substantiates:

"President Holden, of Wooster, has just made an exhaustive study of the catalogues of all theological seminaries in this country. They contain 1915 theological students who are college graduates. Of these 1915 theological students 1805 come from Christian colleges and universities, and the remaining 110 from non-Christian (secularized and undenominational) colleges.

"I find by a careful collation of the last report of the U. S. Commissioner of Education the following facts: There are

about 54,000 youths in college classes in this country, about 28,000 of them in Christian, and about 25,000 of them in non-Christian colleges.

"So there is at present one college graduate theological student for every 16 students in Christian colleges, and one college graduate theological student for every 230 students in non-Christian colleges."

Whilst it is true we do not wish our colleges to be mere preparatory schools for ministers, we do desire that out of them our ministry should come. We do demand that the religious influence shall be such that not only men may be led to the ministry, but also that other educated men, lawyers, doctors, men of science, engineers and the like, be established in the faith, their religious convictions deepened, and they be men with a deep sense of their obligations to their fellow-men and God. Nevertheless we cannot appeal to the loyalty of our people alone to sustain the denominational college. Lutheran is a great word wherewith to charm, but it will not charm parents to send forth their children imperfectly equipped for life's strenuous struggles. There must be more than the name. In the chairs there must be men, able and trained to teach, there must be equipment, fitted to the requirements of the advanced demands of knowledge. It is not to be expected that parents will handicap their children in the strenuous race of the present life by sending them to Lutheran colleges which do not afford an education equal to that given by other colleges.

The Church, if it would keep its young men under its influence, can only do so by strengthening the college faculties. Men can no longer instruct students in several branches and teach each branch well. That is, in these days of specialization, the student can gain inspiration for study in a special branch alone from those who are masters in the department with which they deal, enthusiasts themselves, because they do original work and by independent study gain that mastery and love for their work, which brings the breath of life and enthusiasm to others.

But this means a large corps of instructors even for the small college, 15 to 25 professors. It means thorough equipment, good libraries, scientific apparatus, and—as it has come to be a truism that the body as well as intellect and spirit must be cared for, that intellect and spirit may have strong bodies to respond to their demands—there must be abundant opportunity to build up the body.

The best instructors must be adequately supported if they are to be at our command. This means money. Equipment means money. Physical appliances mean money.

Contrast on this Western field what the State Universities spend in a year for maintenance. \$180,000 in Nebraska, \$120,000 in Kansas. Iowa as much if not more. Then contrast our own colleges on this territory and understand the fearful odds with which they contend.

The following, which appeared in *The Saturday Evening Post*, in an article entitled, "Recent Gifts to Colleges," by James Melvin Lee, indicates how rapidly colleges and universities are increasing their endowments and multiplying their facilities and attractions:

Mr. E. L. Godkin, in retiring from the editorship of the *New York Evening Post*, published his recollections of nearly half a century of journalism, in which he took a pessimistic view of the press and the pulpit; but he thought that the progress made by colleges, big or little, both in the quality of instruction and in the amount of money received from personal gifts and bequests, was something unparalleled in the history of the world.

Though this is an era of large gifts, small ones are so numerous that in the aggregate they rival the former. One denomination has raised, chiefly by small subscriptions, nearly \$5,000,000 for its schools, as a twentieth century thank-offering. The endowment of Brown University has recently been increased by more than \$1,000,000; the complete list of the subscribers to this fund published in the Brown Alumni Monthly, numbered, by actual count, 176 persons, and, deducting the \$250,000 from Mr. John D. Rockefeller, it was for the most part given in fairly small amounts.

One of the most remarkable bequests of the past year was \$1,500,000 left by Mrs. Josephine L. Newcomb, of New York City, to Tulane University. According to information received from the secretary of that institution she had also given \$300,000 just before her death. Fifty thousand dollars has been received to found the library. Large gifts have been hitherto confined to Northern colleges—a fact which the South has lamented—but perhaps the tide is now turning.

Cornell College, of Mount Vernon, Iowa, through two of the trustees, Senator Allison and Governor Shaw, has secured the promise of \$40,000 from Mr. Carnegie. Of course it is for a library, and the conditions are that it shall be free to students and to citizens, and that the sum of \$4,000 shall be guaranteed for its maintenance. Other gifts amount to over \$200,000.

Cornell University, of Ithaca, New York, has received \$75,000 for enlarging the Sibley College of Mechanical Engineering. Other donations foot up \$141,953.

The principal gift to Syracuse University the past year was for a "College of Applied Science," by Mr. Lyman C. Smith. He believes that it will cost not less than \$725,000 before it is finished. Mr. John D. Atchbold has promised \$400,000 for endowment, provided an equal amount is raised by other friends of the institution.

Amherst has raised \$100,000 to increase the salaries of its professors, has added \$50,000 to its endowment, and has raised \$5,000 for various purposes. A promise of \$25,000 has been announced to be added to the fund for a new observatory building in case a like sum can be procured.

Oberlin has received \$120,000 for a gymnasium and a chemical laboratory. In addition, Mr. John D. Rockefeller has made a provisional offer of \$200,000 for general endowment, provided the college raises \$300,000 before January 1, 1902. According to official information \$150,000 has already been provided for.

Exclusive of the gifts made to the Bi-Centennial Memorial Fund, which now amounts to more than \$300,000, Yale has received over \$145,000 since July 31, 1900. An anonymous

gift of \$96,000 for building a dispensary under the charge of the medical department has also been received. Harvard is reported, though not officially, to have received \$735,000.

Other donations and bequests received by American colleges are as follows: Lafayette, 84,500; Princeton, \$250,000; Pennsylvania, \$540,000; Clark, \$3,000,000; Dartmouth, \$210,000; Western Reserve, \$150,000; University of Michigan, \$39,900; Ohio Wesleyan, \$600,000; Union, \$55,000; Columbia, \$492,000; Allegheny, \$170,000; American University, \$130,000; De Pauw, \$242,500; Dickinson, 51,500; and Wesleyan, \$70,000.

Thirty years ago our Lutheran colleges, in endowment, equipment, number of instructors, compared much more favorably with the leading colleges of the land than they do now. There is before us no more necessary work, nor one that our wealthy men should more earnestly sustain with large benefactions than the increase of the endowment and equipment of our colleges. If it be neglected, the future of the Lutheran Church will be meagre in results. The Church, shorn of strength, vitality and aggressiveness, will have little influence as a religious factor in the land.

Such are the facts. What relation has our Board of Education to do with these facts? The Board of Education enables us to found, maintain and strengthen the colleges just where our Church is now weak, but when it has every promise of a glorious future.

Long ago it was seen that if our Church was to supply the needs of its membership, and retain its educated young men, and women, it must have its own institutions right here on this western soil. Splendid Gettysburg and Wittenberg could not draw those seeking higher education to their walls past colleges at their very doors. They went to these nearby institutions, but they failed in many instances to return Lutherans. Young men trained in our seminaries East were not in touch with the life of the West and soon grew weary of work here and returned to the East where they felt more at home. Our ministry was peripatetic, our congregations languished. It was ab-

olutely necessary to found Midland and strengthen Carthage, to build on Western soil a seminary whose young men knew the great people of the Western States, thought their thoughts, lived their life and were proud of their states and thrilled with fiery pulsations of love for their honor and glory. The few years of work which have given us the noble men who are doing splendid work in these Western States have proved the wisdom of all this thought.

But the Board of Education stands for more. It stands for practical endowment. The money the Board receives is for direct expenditure, not for endowment. If the Church gives it an income of \$15,000, it is equivalent to \$300,000 endowment, \$25,000 to \$500,000 endowment, for the colleges it aids. It makes the college financially strong until the institution's constituents endow it well that the Board may found other institutions needed in other portions of our vast country.

The ministry and membership of the General Synod should intelligently grasp the situation. This is necessary work, missionary work of the highest order. Colleges to the Church are like West Point and the Naval Academy to the nation. The Church is militant before it is triumphant. The Church is engaged in the fiercest of all wars, wars waged not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, and against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. Every member of the Church is or may be a soldier in this glorious war, but these soldiers of the Church need leaders and trained leaders. Captains of the Lord's hosts, under captains of that Great Captain of our salvation, Jesus Christ. Our colleges and seminaries train them to lead the membership to victory. The Church therefore that has the eye to see, the brain to conceive, the will to act will put its training schools just where they are needed and when they are needed. To this end it will not count the cost of sacrifice and gifts; for here, under God, it realizes, is the way to victory.

ARTICLE VI.
CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN.

BY REV. M. COOVER, A. M.

Straws show which way the wind blows. Was Jesus a perfect gentleman? Mrs. Agnes Smith Lewis finds a word in the Sinaitic palimpsest that confirms her opinion that he was. John 4 : 24 reads in the Syriac version : "And while they were talking, his disciples came and wondered that with the woman he was *standing* and talking."

The Jewish Rabbi sits while teaching. Jesus was sitting weary at the well, but "prompted by an innate feeling of chivalry" and courtesy for even "the most degraded representative" of womanhood, he rose to his feet to address the woman of Samaria.

The Expository Times for May.

How much of the historic life of Christ in the gospels is to be found in the letters of Paul? Prof. Rhys Rees Lloyd gives his answer in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for April.

There is no mention of supernatural birth ; no allusion to the childhood and youth of Jesus ; no reference to his baptism by water ; and discoverable teaching of Christ is limited to two statements made in the night of his arrest, and these may not be correctly reproduced. "This summary," says Mr. Lloyd, "causes us to wonder at the silence maintained respecting the marvelous discussions and conversations of Jesus." And we wonder too ; not at the silence of the Pauline letters, but at the spectacles through which Prof. Lloyd reads them. Only parallel statements in gospels and letters shine through the glasses, or make any apprehensible impression on the retina ; while di-

rect allusions, principles, spirit, ethical and soteriological facts christologically worded are dark invisible lines. On this principle a credible history of the great life which moves the moral world must be brief indeed, briefer even than two statements; *nihil*.

Did Paul and Silas travel with a Baedeker? Prof. Selwyn thinks that the Septuagint Book of Joshua was the guide book of the Second Missionary Journey. If Prof. Lloyd finds little of the historic Christ in Paul's letters, Prof. Selwyn finds much of Jesus, Son of Naue, in Paul's conceptions. The spirit of Joshua is the Spirit of Jesus. Paul and Silas were prophets, and as Christian prophets "searched the Scriptures in order to find fulfilment." "They were the two spies sent by Jesus, Son of Naue, to spy out the land and Jericho." From Horeb to the Jordan finds its antitype in the descent from "the mountains of Misia to the coast of Troas." The man of Macedonia fulfils the call of the men of Gibeon, or the Captain of the Lord's host with sword in hand challenging Joshua.

The land of Canaan was ordered by Joshua to be described into seven portions. These two Christian prophets divided the Roman Empire into seven portions "to allot to the tribes of the new and greater Israel." When the lots were cast before the Lord at Shiloh the first to come up was the tribe of Benjamin. This was Paul's tribe, and Paul "accepted Macedonia as the inheritance of the Lord." Philippi was their Jericho. Jericho was taken on the seventh day, and the "crowning incident" occurred outside the gate of Philippi on the Sabbath day. Rahab finds fulfilment in Lydia, and the scarlet thread in the Thyratiran purple. "Jericho was 'straitly shut up and made fast with bars; none went out and none came in.' This is fulfilled in the prison at Philippi."

The songs and hymns of Paul and Silas find their type in the shouts of the marching multitude; the noise and simultaneous fall of the walls, in the earthquake and simultaneous opening of the prison doors.

How Lydia becomes the antitype of the ventriloquist (witch) of Endor, and the manner in which Shiloh, (Selo) becomes metamorphosed into Thessalonica, we leave to the reading of the articles themselves for elucidation. And here something from an older document seems to have crept in. Paul and Silas—accompanying Timothy is nobody now, probably uncircumcised—arrive at Thessalonica as the two angels before Sodom. Jason is Lot receiving them. And then an after-suggestion supplements the Baedeker. The raising of the widow's son at Zarephath is the type of resuscitated Eutychus, and all the circumstances of restoration find parallels in the conduct of Paul and Elijah. And finally the Conciliar letter embodying the decrees delivered to the brethren in the cities of Asia Minor has its suggestions in two of its parts in the final exhortation of Joshua to the Israelites (Josh. XXIII 7ff). We surmise that Dr. Selwyn is writing a parody on certain methods of Biblical Criticism. *The Expositor* for July and August.

In the same number of *The Expositor* Dr. George Matheson gives his view of the relation of evolution to the moral life of man.

Toward morality the material world seems perfectly indifferent. The impression on man in the presence of boisterous nature in its stormiest moments is not that the universe is angry, but that it is utterly indifferent. The powers of nature do not manifest enmity, but they do awaken an appalling sense in us that we are overlooked. It is in the moral sphere that we feel this most keenly. But what is the source of this impression? Does it originate with science? Dr. Matheson thinks not. It has arisen from disappointed poetry. "The doctrine of Evolution has disproved the assertion that Nature is morally indifferent." "I think the process of evolution as it appears in our world, is a distinctly moral process." Morality "has come originally from the stars." The growth of moral law is the result of "earthly evolution." "Sin is selfishness and morality is socialness." "Morality is sympathy," feeling for others, "altruism." And where does sympathy come from? The necessities of life

have driven men into companionship. From this feeling of necessary regard has grown sympathy, and from sympathy socialness has come. This reasoning shows that morality has its origin in selfishness, and this is not a happy "star." The order of moral evolution is the selfish necessity of gregariousness for common defence, then the growth of fellow feeling, sympathy, socialness, altruism, morality. Mr. Matheson does not say so, but his evolution of morals results in bald utilitarian ethics. Selfishness then is the root and ethics the fruit. But selfishness is not originally sin. It becomes sin however. They are not synchronous in origin and action. Sin is the far subsequent fruit of selfishness. Selfishness is not sin in the "moneron." "It is not merely that the moneron knows no better; there is no better to be known. There can be no degradation where there is no height." Selfishness is a virtue in the unmoral state. But in the unmoral state there are premonitions of altruism. Swarms of bees and bands of swallows are proofs of the moral attitude of nature, proofs that nature is not morally indifferent. But Dr. Matheson leaps the chasm between inanimate and animate nature and leaves no bridge for us to follow him. We are still far away from the stars.

But what place does Christianity occupy in the system of moral evolution? At what point does Christianity approach man in his rise from the "moneron"? What is the difference between man and the unmoral life that is below him? Is it the endowment of reason? the power of language? the grace of altruistic sympathy and sentiment? In none of these respects is man original. The world of unmoral creatures shares these powers with him. What is it that man possesses *alone*, that differentiates him from the lower animal world? Dr. Matheson is ready to express the supremacy of man in a single sentence: "The developed man is distinguished from the animal nature everywhere in the fact that he alone of all creatures has power of sympathy sufficient to leap the wall of his own species." Christianity in man is simply the spread of his altruism. The dog will spring into the water to save a child, but the act is the

result of training. He will do the same for a stick or an umbrella. The bee in search of nectar carries pollen which fructifies the blossom. But it does it without a purpose. The savage loves and defends those who are of his tribe. Judaism calls all to Jerusalem. Men must become "proselytes of the gate." Buddhism heralds the same cry, "Come into my garden." All these simply manifest altruism within the species. But Christianity leaps the wall of separation between races and makes her altruism cosmopolitan. This is the distinctive feature of Christianity. And Christianity is in no respect a supernatural element. Mr. Matheson emphatically declares this possession which man holds alone to be "the result of his latest development." Christianity does not enter the world as a factor from the supersensible world, but as a fruit of evolution, the product of development. Christianity is "as secular a force in the world as the electric telegraph or the steam engine." When the book comes to be written which explains the place of Christ in the system of evolution its scope and province will be divided between the theologian and the British Association, for Christianity is the discovered "link between the Altruism of the animal nature and the Altruism of the man."

Is Christianity then entirely embraced as a part of natural evolution? or is natural evolution as a system all Christian? Only in the latter aspect can there be such a thing as Christian evolution. A great body of truth has been brought to light through the method of research called evolution, and what shall we do with it? It certainly has a place somewhere. All knowledge is related knowledge; the system of the universe is one, and the ultimate cause must be first and sole. Evolution has rightly nothing to do with origins, only with material phenomena; nothing to do with the First Cause. Its association with phenomena is not causation, but method. It is not the study of origins, or of ends, but rightly deals solely with the conduct of nature. All evolutionists have not been true to evolution. But the trend of science now is toward the separation of the departments of knowledge. All knowledge is related, but its

genetic relations are not yet all known. Some evolutionists have tried to be metaphysicians and theologians to the detriment of evolution. The effort has been to be historic from end to end, or without end in a completed circle of related truths. Evolution has been sought as a principle of consecutive action in nature from the unknown to the unknown, a system complete, linked together in all its parts with no ligament ill-fitting. It must not only be historical, but genetic. This procedure on the part of some scientists has carried evolution out of its province. True evolution will become the Christian theologian's evolution too. It is a method of action in nature that does not eliminate God from his active relation to the universe.

But dangers lurk unseen in subjectiveness and speculation. The Christian evolutionist who takes his evolution into his present study of origins will lose his religion in metaphysics; and if he takes the end of moral endeavor, the law of righteousness, to be the product of natural development, he will metamorphose his religion into ethics.

Because some disciples of evolution have done both these things, some theologians have sought to follow them. But both these efforts transgress the province of evolution. There is no historic point where natural evolution is to be separated from Christian evolution. They are both one, or none. There is a right and possible adjustment of evolution as a system to the body of revealed truth.

The Christian consciousness can find itself at home in it, and hold its religious conceptions still spiritually valid. But the question now is, "What is the scope of evolution?" And the answer is rightly given, "Material phenomena." This is the coming limited province of evolution. Material science deals only with sensible phenomena. The content of the supersensible is not its field.

If the content of religion and of ethics be explained by the attempt of evolution, we reach Feuerbach's faith. Theology becomes but anthropology, and ethics but subjectiveness. The supreme being is man. In his spiritual idealizations man objectifies and contemplates himself. *Homo homini deus*. Exalted

ethical and spiritual conceptions as attributes of God or of man are figments of the imagination. When man idealizes he denaturalizes himself, and departing from his nature he mutilates his true self. If evolution be nature itself and not method, man is but the natural development of the world's inherent forces, and there is nothing above him, nothing higher. And when we turn to origins and ultimates and attempt to solve them by evolution we reach a sort of divine immanence which is nothing short of pantheism. That perfect order which we see is a method of divine action in nature, conscious or unconscious. If the latter, we have Von Hartmann's philosophy; if the former, we have the faith of Spinoza, who says that when we love ourselves, we love God; or of Fichte, who says the same thing negatively. We cannot love God. Our love of God is God's love for himself in us. Hegel generalizes the whole relation of man to God by saying that religion is God's consciousness of himself in us. The highest place of man is to be but a part of something, though that something be the Infinite. The pioneer theological evolutionist, Schleiermacher, our prophet of pantheistic romanticism, finds man reaching the highest conception of himself in his religion, a religion which is man's consciousness of being part of the Infinite. At last ethics too loses its positive content and passes into aesthetics, into a dreamy rest amid the relations of the beautiful. Religion becomes independent of morality and of activity, and is the immediate movement of God in man. To adapt Christ to this system, he must be divested of his divinity, and his gospel must be sublimated into an ethical soteriology. We have this adjustment made by Harnack, who says, "To represent the Gospel as an ethical message is no depreciation of its value."

Jesus had the most intimate and deep knowledge of God, and the closest moral affinity to him. This penetrative knowledge and perfect moral sympathy made Jesus the Son of God. The divinity of Christ was a speculative idea of Paul's. Jesus brought a good man's message to men. "Therefore to say that the Gospel is a matter of ordinary morality is not to misunderstand him." This is the *extract* of the "Essence of Christian-

ity." It is the fruit of evolution carried into religious phenomena. The supersensible is weighed in material balances and found seriously wanting.

The acceptance of evolution as a method of nature does not necessitate the loss of all pure religion, but it does demand some new forms for the religious content. That the forms of our religious content have undergone historic changes and will undergo them is admissible. The new aspect, however, to be true, dare not violate the moral purpose and end of Christian Revelation. It is the unsettled implications of evolution, and not its proved certainties that awakens apprehension.

When the Master of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, was in Constantinople, he observed a burial custom which brought to mind a pamphlet, *The Parable of the Grave-Clothes*, by Rev. Mr. Beard. As the funeral passed Mr. Latham noticed as the corpse lay on a bier that there was an exposure of the face, neck and upper part of the shoulders, leaving a space of a foot or more between the wrappings of the head and of the body. A new argument for the resurrection of Jesus impressed itself upon him, which he produces in his book, *The Risen Master*.

The body of Jesus was laid on a ledge in the rock hewn sepulchre with the head on a slightly elevated step. On the resurrection morning when John entered the empty tomb, "he saw, and believed." What did he see? He saw the linen clothes lying, but the body gone out of them. There lay the cloths as if the body were still in them, only lying slightly flat, but not displaced. The body had just slipped out of them. And where the head lay he saw the napkin lying by itself, the "rolled-round" napkin, (*επτετυλιγμενον*), the curled up headdress, a little flat, but not displaced, the roll still in it. The body could not have been stolen, for that act would have necessitated the unwrapping of the cloths which were left. Nor could friends have removed the body and left the linen cloths as they were lying. The spices were not scattered from unwound cloths indicative of hasty removal. If John had seen cloths unwound and folded, it would have suggested removal of the body. But no hands had been there. The body had passed out of the

cloths and left them undisturbed. That is what John saw; and that is why he believed.

Prof. G. Frederick Wright sees in the Old Testament miracles the element of divine opportuneness. The destruction of Sodom, the parting of the waters of the Jordan for the passing over of Joshua and the hosts of Israel, and the falling of the walls of Jericho are miracles wrought by physical causes through divine agency. Geological disturbances culminated in the destruction of Sodom. An earthquake opened the faucets of spouting oil wells. Subterranean forces made a landslip in the bed of the Jordan and the flow of the waters was momentarily stopped. There was a mine under the walls of Jericho, but so deeply laid that only the divine hand could touch the explosive. But the concurrence of geologic time with the time of these chronicled events is hardly verifiable. The Old Testament history of this period is chronologically established with variations of but several centuries. But geology wants millenniums before historic time for the occurrence of the great Fault of the Jordan valley, and the subsequent physical disturbances significant in that region. Divine opportuneness in miracles, the moving of physical forces by divine agency for moral ends, is quite credible. The principle is acceptable, but in these cases it is difficult to synchronize the facts with geologic time.

Bibliotheca Sacra for April.

Even chickens have evidential value for Old Testament criticism. There is an extra-legal sacrifice still offered by the Jews on the day of Atonement, consisting of a cock. This custom can be traced back nearly to the time of the exile. But the first chapter of Leviticus names the sacrificial animals, the ox, the sheep, the goat, and of fowls, two kinds of doves. The hen was introduced into Palestine by the Persians when they came as conquerors. This fowl was known to the Jews at the time of the exile, but not before. The Levitical code was fixed before the exile, else it would have included among acceptable offerings a clean fowl fit for sacrifice.—*The Expository Times* for Jan.

II.

GERMAN.

BY REV. S. GRING HEFELBOWER, A. M.

During the last week of Sept. 1900, the *Congres scientifique international des catholiques* met in Munich. This association, or diet, of Roman Catholic scientific men, was called into existence in 1888 by Prof. Duilné, Rector of the University of Toulouse, and Msgr. d'Hulst, Rector of the *Institut catholique* in Paris. Since then it has assembled triennially. In 1888 and in 1891 it met in Paris, in 1894 in Brussels, in 1897 in Freiburg in Switzerland, and in 1900 in Munich. At the first three diets the influence of the German Catholics was very small. But a marked change was to be noted at Freiburg, where about one-fourth of the addresses were in German; and at Munich last year about two-thirds of the whole number of addresses were in German. The 260 addresses delivered there were distributed among the several languages represented as follows: German 183; French 41; English 13; Italian 10; Spanish 9; Latin 4. In fact the Congress received its impress and character from the German Catholics present and participating. The "Acts" of this congress have been published in a 518 page vol. Prof. Zoeckler reviewed this report in the *Theologisches Literaturblatt* of June 21st, 1901, as follows:

The animating spirit of the meeting, which was felt in almost every address, "was, when put in few words, 'our scientific work dare not stand behind that of Protestantism.'" "In spite of the humble address of loyalty to the Pope, a marked tendency pervaded the acts of the meeting that recalled the 'Reformed Catholicism' of Schell and J. Mueller." The common assertion that the work of Catholic scientists amounts to little, when compared with that of Protestant students, was most energetically denied by almost every one of the leading speakers. A char-

acteristic expression of this was found in the address on *Catholic Truth as Key to the History of Philosophy*, which was delivered at the first general session by Willman of Prague, author of *History of Idealism*. Beginning with the declaration of Joseph Goerres; 'dig deeper and you will find Catholic foundations everywhere,' he warned expressly against the Rationalism, the Individualism and the 'Relativism' of the reigning spirit of the age in modern scientific work among Protestants, and recommended over against these modern systems (especially that of Kant and his most recent disciples) the coöperation of speculation and religion, as the Catholic *philosophia perennis*, going back to St. Thomas of Aquinas, teaches and exhibits."

The chief address at the second general assembly was by von Hertling on *Christianity and Greek Philosophy*. It was directed against the modern attempts at separating the primitive Christian "kernel and fundamental contents" from the husk in which we find it, as a result of Hellenizing influences already in anti-Nicaean and still more in post-Nicaean times, *i. e.*, he opposed the theory of Harnack and his followers in history of dogma. Hertling's protest against the onesidedness of this view of history included much that was striking and even acceptable to those who hold to the positive evangelical standpoint. "In agreement with the Roman Catholic system, the speaker declared at the close, 'in Thomas Aquinas the relation of Christianity to Greek Philosophy reached its zenith; but he also raised the question as to whether in it the historical process has really closed, and thought, that though formulation of dogmas dare experience no change, the conceptions, which stand or stood only on the periphery of the Christian doctrinal content, are subject to the change of human investigation and thought, just as surely as 'not all that in the 13th century was taken with ecstatic approval from Aristotle, can stand before the increasing knowledge of nature of later ages.'"

The German address, delivered by Hartmann Grisar, Professor of church history at Innsbruck, on *A Wish for Catholic Historical Criticism*, rose almost to a surprising boldness, and warned Catholic students to keep pace with modern science,

and to give up all that was untenable in Catholic tradition. "It sounds strange, indeed, that a priest of a Society of Jesus should raise and defend the accusation against the ultramontane hyperconservatism in the realm of history, 'that it does not pay any attention to the historical genesis and growth of the hundred-fold errors, that appeared in a former age, and were circulated, mostly in good faith.' The speaker received marked applause, in spite of the unreserved way in which he made war on the superstitions connected with relics and miracles in Catholic popular writings, and on the non-critical holding of traditions connected with the Catacombs and other ecclesiastical monuments, and on the remaining untenable legends in the Breviary and in the stories of the martyrs, etc. On page 142 of the Report we read: 'The address made a profound impression on the assembly, which found expression in a storm of applause.'" Yet the address of Grisar showed plainly enough, toward the end, that its critical propositions are not intended as attacks on the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical system. 'A close sympathy with church authority' must unconditionally be preserved in the completion of this critical process of purification, which has been taken in hand. Under all conditions one must avoid wounding the Christian spirit by a too merciless procedure against venerable traditions, that have become dear to the Catholic common people. 'For example, it would be altogether unseemly for a person to announce to the people from the pulpit, in a tone of marked superiority, or even derision, that the *Casa santa di Loreto* was not borne thither by angels from Nazareth.' Thus even here is seen the well known opportunism of the Jesuitical method of teaching and politics."

Prof. de Lapparent, in mentioning the great services of his deceased colleague, Prof. d'Hulst, of the Paris *Institut catholique*, spoke at length of the exact scientific method of investigation, especially as it appeared toward the end of the last century, and its relation to faith and the Catholic Church, and expressed the opinion that it meant no danger whatever for Catholicism. Grauert, the historian from Munich, voiced the same sentiments. Throughout the Congress the Catholic natural scientists showed

a very kindly feeling of appreciation for their fellow investigators among the Protestants, and did not hesitate to express it whenever occasion permitted.

These congresses are divided into eight sections, according to the various subjects treated: Science of Religion, Philosophy, Social and Legal Science, History, History of Art and Civilization, Orientalia, Philology and Natural Science. Prof. Bardenhewer published a volume of "Biblical Studies" of the diet, for which he selected ten addresses from the Orientalia section (almost all of the addresses in this section were on, or immediately connected with, biblical themes) and two from the section that treated of the Science of Religion.

Prof. Zoeckler chose two of these theses as characteristic of the modern Catholic striving after more exact scientific method in Old Testament work. Prof. Hoberg, of Freiburg in Br., closed his address on *Negative and Positive Criticism of the Pentateuch*," with demand, that "over against the non Catholic investigation of the Pentateuch there must be placed a Catholic critique, which is strong in itself and is not conscious of continual dependance upon the former." The Jesuit, von Humelauer, of Valkenburg in Holland, in his address *Concerning Deuteronomy*, offers a specimen of such an independent Catholic criticism of the Pentateuch, in which he shows a marked approach to the position of the Wellhausen school, as is shown by the following conclusions: The collection of laws in Deut. 12, to 26, 15 contains fragments of the "words of Joshua." And before the royal law of Samuel is to be placed the "real Mosaic kernel" of Deut., the Mosaic law, Deut. 6, 1 to 7, 11. This primitive "Thora" with the curse chapter, Deut. 28, form the "covenant words" of the second covenant entered into by Moses in Moab, etc. Other addresses revealed similar tendencies. Hence we are forced to the conclusion, that there is a higher criticism in the Roman Catholic Church which is closely related to that of the Wellhausen school.

Grisar, the Jesuit professor of Church History in Innsbruck, is publishing a *History of Rome and the Popes in the Middle Ages*,

which Prof. Tschackert reviews in the *Theologisches Literaturblatt* of July 5th. Though Grisar professes to view the events that he chronicles without prejudice, he shows plainly, in the coloring that he gives events, that he is an ultramontane Jesuit. The view-point, from which he examines everything, and in the interests of which everything is presented, is that of unity under the Pope, which, as a moulding and directing thought, can be traced on almost every page. In fact Tschackert thinks that the evident purpose for which the work was written is the glorification of the Papacy. The history of the city of Rome is used merely as a back-ground, on which to show the popes to the best advantage. Grisar shows the same critical attitude toward the "trash of legend and superstition" that he assumed before the Catholic congress in Munich in 1900; but he accepts the legend of Peter, on which the entire Jesuitic and Vatican conception of the Papacy rests, and builds his history of the popes on it.

Tschackert notes the great contrast between Grisar's history and that of Gregorovius (*History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages*). The latter holds up the picture of the "eternal city," and presents the popes in strict objectivity. The heroic characters among them, those who accomplished something good, are given the prominence they deserve, and the bad popes are shown in realistic faithfulness. Hence, in spite of all the results of recent investigation, the work of Gregorovius is no more likely to be set aside as out of date than one of the chief works of Ranke or Karl Hase. No wonder the later Catholic scientists working in this field refuse to bow under the yoke of Gregorovius, for it is but natural that the ultramontanizing of learning should bring early and characteristic fruits just here.

It seems almost that an evil fate pursued Grisar's work, for at the same time Graf Hoensbroech's important volume on *Das Papstthum in seiner sozial-kulturellen Wirksamkeit* appeared, which shows the work of the Papacy in impeding progress, and going to the sources, produced terrible pictures of the inquisition and various superstitions. It presents a night-scene, dark and awful, over against Grisar's bright picture in light colors.

It is true that Hoensbroech's book is one-sided. But that which it offers is true, which accounts for the great influence it exercises already. A second edition followed close upon the first. And, in spite of its one-sidedness, Tschackert prophesies that from all appearances it will occupy a lasting place in German historical literature, and prove to be a healthful corrective for those who may be captivated by Grisar's master work.

Prof. Wilderboer, in his address delivered on the occasion of his surrendering the rectorship of the University of Groningen in Holland, criticized severely the one-sided use of the doctrines of development, when applied to the religious history of Israel. He declared unconditionally that the oft repeated alternative is false: Either a decline of the religion of the people from the original height, which the prophets still represented, or a development of the old religion, still fostered by the people, to the ethical Javehism of the prophets.

He claims that there existed, at the time of the appearance of Javehism, a religion of the people, which Javehism had to overcome. The essential content of this primitive religion is to be determined chiefly by comparison with the religion of the ancient Arabians. The mingling of Javeh and his cult with Baal of the Canaanites, occasioned by Javeh, the Sinai God, becoming Lord of Canaan and supplanting Baal, had a greater meaning for the religion of the people in the land of Canaan. Javehism did not only stand in opposition to this religion of the people, compounded out of different elements, it derived also much from it. This is true both in its religious customs and in its conceptions. The hope of immortality and belief in the resurrection are also, in part, conditioned by these factors. In a word the numerous phenomena cannot be brought under the categories of "decline" or "development." We cannot explain the ancient religious life of Israel by an "either-or." Wilderboer sums up the result briefly as follows: Two elements extend through the history of the Israelitish religion: We have a natural and an ethical element, or, if you prefer, a developed and an instituted religion. And the latter does not proceed

from the former—a thought that, in the main point, would be accepted by most Old Testament students.

Wurm has also raised his voice against the one sided application of the idea of development to the religious history of Israel in *Beitraege zur Foerderung christlicher Erkenntniss*. He discusses the historico-religious paralels to the Old Testament, in three sections. In the first, which treats of the primitive religion, Wurm seeks to prove that the historico-religious paralels throughout confirm Paul's conception as found in Rom. 1 : 18, *et seqq.*, for there is nowhere a real difficulty in tracing the existing heathen religions back to a primitive monotheism; while, on the other hand, there are great difficulties, especially the unity of God in the religions of uncultured peoples, in accounting for them on the basis of a primitive polytheism. In the second section, which treats of the national religions, and the position of the law in them, the Graf-Wallhausen theory is refuted by historico religious paralels, and it is proven that the Old Testament giving of the law, according to its chief elements, does not come from a post-exilian period, or the time of later kings, but is the original bond which made the people of Israel a civilized people. The third section treats of the transition of the national religion to a world religion, and shows that Christianity alone is the really redeeming universal religion, in which the religious conception found its purest expression.

Dr. Theodore Elze published a pamphlet on *Luthers Reise nach Rom*, which has been reviewed by Bossert. The pamphlet and the review show clearly that the four chief problems connected with this journey of Luther are as unsettled as ever. Up to the present time there is no agreement as to the date, occasion, Luther's relation to the occasion, and the road traveled. Elze sets as the time the late Fall, Winter and Spring of 1510 and 1511. He thinks that the occasion was matters connected with the Augustinian cloister at Wittenberg, and that Luther was a messenger or chosen delegate to the Pope to attend to the matter, whatsoever it was.

ARTICLE VII.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

BOARD OF PUBLICATION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL. PHILADELPHIA.
1522 ARCH STREET.

Elementary Homiletics or Rules and Principles in the Preparation and Preaching of Sermons. By the Rev. Jacob Fry, D. D., Professor of Homiletics and Sacred Oratory in the Lutheran Seminary at Mount Airy, Philadelphia, Pa. Second Edition. Revised and Improved. Pp. 215. \$1.00.

We welcome this book to our table, and we expect to use parts of it to illustrate, supplement and confirm passages in our own lectures on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons. The author speaks the language of sound judgment and of large experience. We like his fundamental principle: "Preaching is the chief business of the Christian ministry," p. 11. This is *apostolic*. Paul says: "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel," 1 Cor. 17. It is also *Lutheran*. Luther says: "Upon whom the preaching office is conferred, upon him is conferred the highest office in the Christian Church. He may baptize, administer the Lord's Supper, and discharge all pastoral duties, or if he do not so wish, he may abide in preaching alone, and leave to others baptism and other subordinate duties, as Christ did, and Paul and all the apostles, Acts 6." *Erl. Ed.* 22: 151.

With this principle in the foreground, and kept steadily in view, no intelligent writer is likely to err widely in teaching the science of preaching. At least we feel sure that Dr. Fry is thoroughly sound in all his main conceptions; and we believe that the minister who studies well and applies the rules, suggestions and cautions, contained in this book; that is, applies them, not slavishly, but in the free exercise of his own gifts and personality, will not fail to make preaching his chief business. We therefore endorse the fundamental principle with which this book starts.

The author modestly calls his book, *Elementary Homiletics*. Nevertheless he has given us in these 215 pages both *multum* and *multa*. We wish that he may find the necessary time, and have the inclination, to develop these *rules* and *principles* into a treatise three times as large as the present volume. There is need, we think, of just such a work as we suggest, a work by a competent hand on Homiletics according to the Lutheran conception of preaching.

We especially like Dr. Fry's *Methods of Division*, pp. 80 *et seqq.*, and approve the emphasis that he places on the *Analytical* or *Textual Method*. This, of course, is not the only lawful method of division, nor

with all texts the best method, nor with some texts a reasonably possible method, but it is prominently the *Lutheran* method, the method by which the preacher can best unfold and apply the truths of God's word. While other methods of division may occasionally be employed for the purpose of emphasizing certain truths, or of answering objections or of treating delicate subjects, yet upon the whole that method of division will be found most fruitful which brings the largest amount of divine truth to bear on the minds and hearts of the hearers of the sermon.

We must also commend Dr. Fry's illustrations or examples of the various methods of division. These examples are so good and suggestive that we fear they will prove a temptation to many students of his book—not to imitate by diligent study, but to appropriate bodily. As a rule it is only the good that is appropriated.

With what the author says on *The Composition of the Sermon*, pp. 134 *et seq.*, we are in hearty accord. Too many sermons are simply thrown together, much as billets of wood are thrown on a heap. There is utter lack of order, articulation, purpose. Thoughts cross each other at every possible angle. The end is not seen at the beginning, and is not held steadily in the mind's eye as the speaking proceeds. Often the speaking is not preaching, but a confused and rambling talk. It can make no definite impression. Every sentence strikes at a different place. A good plan is absolutely necessary to the composition of a good sermon. The preacher must be an architect. He must also be a wise master-builder. He must gather his materials with care; he must keep his audience in view; he must choose his language with reference to force, elegance and propriety. "Every young preacher should write out one sermon every week," p. 136. The young preacher who does not heed this suggestion for at least the first ten years of his ministry, will, in all probability, do like "the empty cart" of which the author speaks in another place—he will "rattle," and we may add, Will soon go a begging.

Dr. Fry lays much stress on *Declamation or Delivery*. Here he treats excellently of *Voice, Utterance, Gesture*. We commend the chapters to all who think that God will be specially effective through the low, indistinct, monotonous, affected, nasal, "professional," tones of a preacher. A strong, sonorous, manly voice, intelligently and sympathetically used, is, on the human side, the mightiest element of a minister's power. Yet the voice is an instrument for which at least a majority of ministers have very little concern. Preaching is divine Truth through personality. The more attractive and effective the personality, the more effective the truth will be. Dr. Fry's suggestions on the training and use of the voice, are very practical. A good voice, clear and distinct utterance, and appropriate gestures, seldom come to the preacher, except as the result of long and patient self-training.

The poet is born; the orator is made, that is, chiefly self-made. "Every man therefore who enters the pulpit is bound by the highest motives to give all diligence in cultivating his powers of speech, and in studying the recognized laws of oratory," p. 175.

But why particularize? The clerical reader of this notice will do himself and his congregation a real service by studying this book carefully, and by making a diligent application of its "rules and principles in the preparation and preaching of sermons." He will also find the literary style of the book, good—clear, concise, and generally correct. But we venture to suggest that the author and the reader examine the words, "excellencies," pp. 173, 174, and "none," p. 146, in the *Century Dictionary*. On pages 125-6 it is clearly implied by the grammar that a "hammer" is to be "driven in." Nor can we refrain from calling attention to the author's constant omission of the conjunctive *that*, before subordinate clauses, as twice, for instance, on p. 208, last line and line ten from the bottom. Such omission in such sentences is certainly not justified by classic English usage. But these lapses are only *ut maculae solis*.

What we have written up to this time is intended to express our opinion on the more strictly homiletical parts of this book. On the *Selection of Texts*, Dr. Fry has this to say: "Ordinarily the text of the sermon for the chief service of the day should be taken from the *Gospel* or *Epistle* for the day, either whole or in part," p. 36. This thesis is supported by the usual arguments, as (a) such selection makes Christ the centre of the sermon; (b) It preserves the cultus of our Church; (c) It maintains the communion of saints; (d) "It preserves the congregation from being subject to the special whims, likes or dislikes, of the preacher in the choice of texts and topics;" (e) "It saves the preacher from the perplexity and loss of time incident to selecting at random"—the three last words from *contradictio in adjecto*.

Now we do not deny that there are some advantages in voluntarily following—Dr. Fry is "very far from believing or advocating the compulsory use, by ecclesiastical enactments or otherwise, of these *pericopes* as the invariable texts for the sermon at the chief service of each Sunday," p. 39—the *pericopes*. But long study and careful observation have convinced us that the ends to be attained, as suggested by Dr. Fry, can be just as easily and *more fully* attained by the thoughtful and judicious preacher, who makes his own selections in view of known wants of the congregation. And as for the argument connected with the "whims" of the preacher, we regard that as too *whimsical* and too weak to claim serious attention, and it is utterly refuted by the history of preaching, which shows only too evidently that the observance of the *pericopal* system has not preserved the congregations from the whims, vagaries, conceits, arbitrarinesses, etc., of the preachers. Under Romanism these very *pericopes* have been made to set forth the

merits of the saints, and of the Virgin. Under Orthodoxy they were made convenient pretexts for sermons against the Catholics, the Reformed, the Socinians, the Macedonians, the Patripassians, the Valentinians. Carpzov suggested a hundred methods of dividing a text, and well illustrated his artificiality, not to say, whimsicality, by preaching a whole year on Christ as an artisan, and described him as a cloth-maker (Matt. 6 : 25), as a lamp-maker (Luke 2 : 47), as an upholsterer. M. Dietrich named Christ "the best chimney-sweep," and then described the chimney-sweep, the flue, the broom. On another occasion his theme was: "*Christ as a Target, the arrows, the miss-shots.*" Sustmann took for his subject *Christi Esel*, and then preached on our "asinine nature." Reimer preached on the Holy Ghost as a "big cannon" (Karthanne). Andrew Schoppius preached on the origin of the human hair, and thundered against the tobacco-brothers and the tobacco-sisters. These and other themes equally monstrous were extracted from the *pericopes*; and in the grand old days of Orthodoxy the sermons were so long that Gerber complains that in the churches and chapels, the people laughed, and jested, and conversed, and even slept. "Churches and chapels were turned into beer-halls and theatres. Yea, we read that during the divine service people got drunk and committed offences that cannot even be named." Kahnis, *Deutscher Protestantismus* I., 115.

And every reader of the *QUARTERLY* is supposed to know that under the dominance of Rationalism these same *Pericopes* were made the starting points for lectures on farming, vaccination, the making of wills, on birds, beasts and fishes.

And as for keeping Christ at the centre and maintaining the cultus of the Church, and preserving the communion of the saints, we know that Rationalism drove Christ completely from the centre, debased the cultus of the Church, and ignored the communion of the saints.

It is thus demonstrable that the *Pericopes* provide the congregation with no final guarantee against the special whims, the likes and dislikes, of the preacher. Indeed they may be used, and have been used, to give a certain authority to clerical whims. The remedy against clerical whims is clerical common sense. The minister who has good common sense joined with intelligent piety and a devout spirit, does not need to bow his head to an external yoke, whether such be made by civil or ecclesiastical enactments, or by the dictation of the self-appointed guardians of the Church's doctrine and practice, who are wont to charge disloyalty upon everyone who does not follow the traditions of the elders.

As for the argument about "selecting at random," that is a reflection on the tens of thousands of wise and faithful preachers in our own and in other lands, who judiciously adapt means to ends by selecting texts that will furnish themes for sermons best suited to the demands of the hour. The many should not be deprived of the large liberty they have

in Christ, because a few preachers, who have "special whims," and "select at random," have abused that liberty.

But we do not wish to be misunderstood. We are heartily in favor of all the legitimate ends aimed at by the *pericopal* system. But, as already intimated, we believe that these ends can be *more fully* attained by the free selection of texts. There is *only a small part* of Christ, and *of the communion* of the saints, and *of the spirit and principles* of worship, contained in the *pericopes*. The selection is conspicuous for omissions, rather than for inclusions. It leaves out some of the most precious and important parts of the Gospels and Epistles. In the *Table of the Epistles and Gospels for the Sundays and Festivals of the Church Year*, now before the American Lutheran Church, only thirty verses are taken from the Gospel of Mark. From the same table the entire Old Testament is omitted, except a few verses from Isaiah, Joel and Jeremiah; also all of the Acts of the Apostles except thirty-one verses, and all of the Apocalypse, the Parable of the prodigal son, the conversation of Christ with the woman of Samaria, the restoration of Peter, all the parables in Matthew 13 except one, a very large part of the Sermon on Mount, the Lord's Prayer, Matt. 6: 15; and from the Epistles very many of the most effective passages on justification. Hence the preacher who preaches from these "Epistles" and "Gospels" year after year, or even "ordinarily" takes his text from these sources, whether he do it in obedience to prescriptive regulation, or to churchly custom, or to self-imposed limitation as the custom of some is, will find that he cannot give his people a comprehensive knowledge of the Scriptures in their organic unity. Much of the counsel of God respecting their salvation will be necessarily withheld from them, unless the preacher make digressions that are homiletically unwarrantable, just as in Germany, where the use of the *Pericopes* is compulsory, the more conscientious and spiritual pastors have been wont to do. "Moreover, with prescribed texts *the necessary attention* to the present *special needs and circumstances of the congregation is made too difficult* for the preacher, as is also the free *outpouring of his own spiritual life*, of the truths and experiences of life which have been affecting him throughout the week. In this way not only is the congregation's desired to learn, which should always remain fresh, easily hindered, and weakened, so that at length many have no conception of the inexhaustable riches of Scripture, but even the preacher, who is spared the trouble of a spontaneous choice of text, only too often falls into a *rut* equally injurious to himself and the people." Christlieb, *Homiletic*, p. 214. It is exactly in this connection that Christlieb says that "in respect of Scripture knowledge, especially of the Old Testament, an average German congregation is generally notably behind English Protestantism."

Now this may be considered a severe judgment, but it comes from one who as preacher, pastor and professor, had had ample experience, and who will not be charged with prejudice against the average German

congregation. It is well-known also that both Spener and Francke found the people of their day in almost heathenish ignorance of the Bible, and that they instituted *Bibelstunden* for the removal of this ignorance.

Again: The endorsement of the *pericopal* system by German preachers has been by no means so universal as many persons suppose. Luther retained the *pericopes* out of respect for tradition, and "because there are so few preachers who can treat an entire evangelist effectively, and profitably, and because therewith we shall prevent the license of the sectaries and fanatics"—which clearly implies that had circumstances been different, he would have broken away from tradition, and then it would have been Lutheran *not to use* the *pericopes*. He complained that "from St. Paul's Epistles mostly those passages were chosen which treat of external works and exhortation. The person who prescribed them was very unlearned, and thought too much of works"—which must be regarded as a most just criticism in view of the fact that in the table to which reference has been already made, not one word has been taken from the first five chapters of Romans, only fifty-four verses from Galatians, and one short lesson from five verses from Hebrews. Philip Jacob Spener, "who gave life to the Lutheran Church, as Luther gave it doctrine," wrote: "How heartily did I wish that we had never admitted in our churches the use of the *pericoparum evangelicarum*" (*Bedenken*, III., 128). It is well known that to the required text Spener often added one of his own choosing, and then based his sermon on the latter. Reinhard said: "The *pericopes* are in part very badly chosen, and are far from being effective." Herder is represented as "comparing the compulsory use of the *pericopes* to a fence in the garden of Scripture, which prevents the man who is imprisoned within it from enjoying any fruits outside it, compels him to walk every year certain steps up and down, and finally permits him to preach on the three letters of the word 'and,'" (Christlieb), *Homiletic*, p. 219. Stier, the author of *The Words of Jesus*, himself a great preacher, declares: "The *pericopes* have in them a Catholic element in the evil sense of the word; a semi-pelagian interest has unmistakably prevailed in their selection; the Gospels have been selected in a certain seeking after miracles and with a clinging to the externals of the Gospel, the Epistles almost entirely in a kind of bias toward mere morality,"—which may be rather a strong arraignment, but it contains, undeniably, a large amount of truth, and is substantially a repetition of Luther's criticism. But strongest of all are the objections of that most orthodox and powerful preacher, the redoubtable Claus Harms. We name in brief his six "disadvantages" of continuous preaching on the gospel *pericopes*. "In the gospel lessons the Gospel is not preached. How could the Gospel be preached from them? It is not in them." Luther and Spangenberg have long ago said the same. Even the Apostles are authorities here. They make but little use of the passages contained in the gospel *Peri-*

copes. "I do not say: The order of Salvation, Christianity, the Gospel, cannot be preached, and is not preached; but I say: These *Pericopes* hinder, and render it difficult to do so. This is the first disadvantage."

2. The gospel *Pericopes* favor the rationalistic preachers: "For this reason the rationalistic preachers always prefer 'the very words of Jesus,' and fight shy of the Epistles. One can preach on all the gospel *Pericopes*, and need not touch a single Christian doctrine. Even in the gospel for Trinity Sunday several themes may be found which completely excluded its Kernel."

3. A third disadvantage is that it will be found to be difficult year after year to find a new theme. Consequently the preacher will fall back on the old material. He here quotes Reinhard as we have done above.

4. "The fourth disadvantage is that it promotes laziness in the preachers. The gospel for the Sunday is as familiar to them as their own house, in which they can go round in the dark. The two or three themes on which they have already preached several times recur at once. The familiar exegesis is at hand. The Introduction, Proposition, Division, rise unbidden before the mind, and all the material comes as of itself. If this be not the case, yet is the world full of printed sermons and sketches on the gospel *Pericopes*."

5. The hearers lose interest. The *Pericope* is too familiar. The people look asleep, even though they keep their eyes open.

6. "Books of sermons are common, and it is said: Our preacher does not preach nearly so well on the *Pericope* as we read in our sermon book. Why need we go to church?" * * * "Some will say: The preachers ought to be ashamed to warm over their old sermons, while we give them fresh grain and fresh money for their work, and bring them fresh hearts to hear what has never yet been preached to us. Others say: What need do we have of a preacher, since he never presents anything new? Let us buy a round of sermons for a few years from an old preacher, or at auction, and give the sexton a couple of dollars to read them to us in the church." "Sing unto the Lord a new song." *Pastoral Theology*, I., 5, 6.

We regard these "disadvantages," of which we have given only the substance, as absolutely decisive against the use of the *Pericopes* "ordinarily," or as a rule, whether such rule be established by authority, or be self-imposed. Harms tells us that once and again he preached the year through on free texts. His example is worthy of imitation, and his success may well be envied. And so effective was his criticism, that in Germany almost every Lutheran *Landeskirche* has ordered one or more courses of new *Pericopes* to be used in alternation with the old. Achelis, *Prakt. Theol.* I., 340.

That the preacher can often find a suitable theme for his sermon in the *Pericope*, no one can deny; but that the system brings limiting and

hampering conditions; that it hinders the fulness of the presentation of the Gospel, that it exposes the preacher to grave temptations—these are facts established by the testimony of not a few of the best, wisest and holiest men that ever stood in a pulpit.

But the decisive question with us should be, Who gave us authority to ignore such large parts of God's Word; to deprive the people of hearing the whole counsel of God; to harp on the same string, and to sing the same song year after year from the pulpit? The Bible is larger than the Prayer Book, and the authority of God is weightier than that of Jerome, of Charlemagne, of Luther, of tradition. It is no answer to our inquiry to say, that the extra-pericopal portions of the Scriptures can be treated at the second service, or at the mid-week meeting. It is a sad fact that all such services are lamentably ill-attended; and equally sad is the fact that the average preacher makes but imperfect preparation for such services. Certainly the preacher owes the fulness and the richness of the Gospel chiefly to his morning audience—to the aged who need the consolation of the Gospel, and to the young who need its instruction. When the preacher is confined, or confines himself, year after year to a small round of Scripture, he dwarfs his mind as a Bible student, and he shortens his arm as a sower of the good seed, and must expect to reap a small harvest. Rather should he "stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free and be not entangled again in the yoke of bondage," and inquire, "Now, therefore, why tempt ye God, that ye should put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?" Acts. 15:10.

We would not throw away the the *pericopes*. We would not, as we did not, ignore them in practice. But we would hold ourselves free from their bondage, and use them only when they furnish a more suitable text for the gospel message than we can find elsewhere in the Word of God. That great preacher, and most fruitful and suggestive teacher of Homiletics, the late Dr. Theodore Christlieb, of Bonn, has fairly well voiced our sentiments on this subject: "Let us therefore leave the *Pericopes* standing as the Church Lectionary, though in revised form and completed by further yearly courses (whether much longer passages of Scripture should be used for this purpose is another question, and belongs to Liturgics), and let us recognize in them the value of a venerable church custom, and at the same time, for beginners a guide in the choice of texts, which on the whole is useful, to which also it must always be left free to have recourse in the sermon; yet the disadvantages of the *compulsory use* [or of the *voluntary adoption*] of the *Pericopes* for the choice of the *text*, its injurious effects upon the preacher and people, are so many and serious, and, on the other hand the advantages of the free choice of texts—partly for the preacher in relation to independence and spontaneity, the variety, freshness, and directness of his testimony, and partly for the people and their growth

in deeper and more complete knowledge of Scripture—are so many and important, that the *free choice of the text*, which prevails in most of the Evangelical Churches, and, as a matter of fact, proves itself to be by far the most rich in blessings, is *much to be preferred*." *Homiletic*, p. 220.

J. W. RICHARD.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY, BOSTON.

The *Atlantic Monthly* for October comes this month with a heavily bordered cover in honor of the lamented President. It also contains an article on "The Death of the President," which certainly was prompt. Indeed the *Atlantic* was the first of the monthlies to appear containing mention of the tragedy. We always expect something choice in this magazine, but this is one of the best numbers we have seen. The paper on "The Ills of Pennsylvania" is likely to excite wide-spread interest and attention. It is a brilliant and fearless paper and the only regret the reader has is that he may not know who its writer is. "Reconstruction and Disfranchisement;" "The Undoing of Reconstruction;" "Yale's Fourth Jubilee;" The Piracy of Public Franchises;" "College Honor;" "Reminiscences of a Dramatic Critic;" "An English Writer's Notes on England;" "The Author of Obermann;" "Small Voices of the Town;" "A Problem in Arithmetical Progression," and "What the Public Wants to Read" are all papers of very much more than ordinary merit. Then the fiction and poetry of this number are particularly good. While other magazines are endeavoring to compensate their subscribers for giving them poor-rate literature by giving them illustrations, the *Atlantic* never once lowers its literary standard, but is more than ever the leading monthly magazine without which no student or scholar can afford to do.

ABBAY PRESS, 114 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK.

As Ithers See Us. By Percy Vere. Pp. 177. \$1.00.

Under the above pen name, the initiated recognize Rev. J. T. Huddle, one of our young Philadelphia pastors, who, in a series of essays holds up the mirror of self-knowledge to the reader, hoping that those who hitherto have been beholding themselves in a glass darkly may see face to face the faults and foibles that are theirs. "Or, in other words" says the author, "I have a few little mischievous foxes, caught in vineyards here and there, which I wish to exhibit for your inspection. Most of them are mine, caught while gnawing my own vines; but if you find among them any bearing your own mark you are welcome to appropriate them."

In a keen and witty, but quite informal manner, Mr. Huddle presents the common faults of man, the failings of the "fairly good" that sour many a sweet life, that poison church and home, that make man wonder if he has a friend.

The literary style of this book is generally good. The mechanical

work is excellent. Altogether one cannot fail to find it pleasant reading; unless, perhaps, one sees in the mirror held up a too familiar failing and finds among the little foxes some of his own that baffle the trap of his good sense.

We heartily commend this series of essays to the readers of the *QUARTERLY*. It is a good book to have in the home, to be read alike by old and young, and insures an entertaining and a profitable hour to all who opens it covers.

M. E. RICHARD.

EATON AND MAINS, NEW YORK.

An Introduction to Political Economy. By Richard T. Ely, Ph. D., LL. D., Professor of Political Economy and Director of the School of Economics and Political Science in the University of Wisconsin. New and Revised Edition. (8x5½; pp. x. 377).

A new edition of Professor Ely's popular "Introduction to Political Economy," bringing it by revision down to date, is an important and welcome book. The first gratifying fact to be noted with regard to it is that in the body of the discussion the old division of the subject under the heads of Production, Exchange, Distribution and Consumption is retained. Until a more natural division is found it is desirable to keep the old as conducing both to clearness and to completeness of treatment. The reader is in no danger of losing himself, and can see the relations of things more easily and comprehend better the value of what is new. There may be a greater appearance of originality if a writer pursues his subjective method, but the reader's ease is promoted if the familiar paths are followed.

We can hardly defend the awkward definition hidden away on page 86; "Political Economy is the science of those social phenomena to which the wealth-getting and wealth-using activities of man give rise."

The most recent theories of the science are lucidly presented. The introduction of ethical considerations to supplant the "enlightened self-interest" of the older Economists is strongly advocated. This may at first seem like a radical departure in the science and a great ennoblement of the discussion, but really it makes little difference. Righteousness and self-interest lead to the same end, though it may be admitted that the former usually moves by a more direct road. Possibly economics with its self-interest can render aid to ethics with its altruism to as great an extent as practical ethics can aid economics. No great harm can result, however, by removing from a text-book on economics the old-standing and prejudicial declaration that the science is founded on selfishness.

The fairness with which the author treats the doctrine of protection, the subject of labor organizations and the wages question marks a distinct advance beyond earlier economists, and if we mistake not, beyond his less mature self. On the matter of strikes, monopolies and various socialistic measures he recognizes the definite and positive convictions

into which the ideas of thinking men are hardening where a decade ago all was in solution and uncertainty.

The style of the work is exceptionally fluent, popular and entertaining. Perhaps the very facility of the author occasionally becomes a snare and betrays him into statements that have no discoverable relation to the subject (see p. 34.). Important matters are often too briefly stated and unimportant ones are too much emphasized by expansion. We have a right to be exacting on these points in a book that has long been before the public and widely useful. There is probably no other treatise which gives so satisfactorily to the general reader the present status of economic science and is so fresh in its illustrations.

JOHN A. HIMES.

Daniel, Darius the Median, Cyrus the Great. A Chronologico-Historical Study Based on the Results of Recent Researches and from Sources Hebrew, Greek, Cuneiform, etc., by Joseph Horner, D. D., LL. D. (7½x5; pp. 142).

The complete title of this treatise is given by the author in his Preface as: "Daniel, Darius the Median and Cyrus the Great; an authentication of Daniel's book, an identification of the Median, an elucidation, in part, of the story of the Great King and parts of the books of Jeremiah and Ezra; aiming by information derived from recent researches and from sources HEBREW, GREEK, CUNEIFORM, etc., to bring more clearly into view the general and singular accuracy of the Biblical historical notes, for the period from the fall of Nineveh, B. C. 607, to the reign of Darius the Persian, son of Hystaspes, B. C. 521; with tabulated chronology and related suggestions, geographical, exegetical, etc.; the whole intended as an effort, in its sphere, corrective of some of the errors, oversights, misinterpretations, etc., of former writers, and of the later destructive criticism."

The chief problem of the writer is the identification of the tribes and rulers of profane with those of sacred history. The solution of it is undertaken in no iconoclastic spirit; due weight is given to tradition, but the old puzzles are attacked with the aid of whatever additional knowledge is furnished by recently deciphered inscriptions and by research. Proper caution is observed in drawing inferences and the conclusions may therefore be received with considerable favor. Repetition is resorted to for the sake of clearness but with the effect rather of confusion; an improved method would produce better results and make the book easier reading for the uninformed and unscholarly.

JOHN A. HIMES.

